

Our dollars continue to flow outward, along with our gold reserves, and an annual deficit for many years now decreased our gold supply to its lowest point. As long as this situation continues, and as long as world faith in our credit lives, there will be many countries which will see little need, or desirability, for the Special Drawing Rights.

Any loss of faith in our credit, causing a substantial demand for gold in exchange for dollars held by foreign nations would, however, certainly not be mitigated by any "paper gold" in existence. On the contrary, since the use of such a scheme is expected to enlarge the debt structure, while causing no improvement in the deficit problem, it

could hasten the loss of faith and accelerate the demand of many nations for true value in metallic gold.

Gold is one of the most powerful incentives. Gold and the power it provides cause dictatorships to come into being, personal rights to be violated and civilizations to fall. Our inflation would not have progressed as it did, if it were not for the printing press money made possible by its low percentage of backing in gold. Our national debt would cause much greater concern among influential financiers, and probably would not have reached its towering height, if it were not for the "gold" represented by the interest being earned by national and international

interests, which in many cases also profit from the sale of a large share of the goods paid for by the borrowed money.

As long as financial gain of those in controlling positions would be adversely affected by sound programs, we will continue to see plans similar to the "paper gold" scheme advanced as panacea for world problems. We will find such schemes generally accepted on the basis that intelligent world leaders would not be supporting them unless they were workable and beneficial.

There probably was never a dictator in history who was not intelligent, but benevolence and altruism are not virtues which must accompany high mental capacity.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1967

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of all mercies: Again we come before Thee, standing in the need of prayer. We have not always recognized this need. We have thought ourselves equipped and adequate for whatever the day might bring forth.

But this day brings forth such massive responsibilities, raises such tangled problems, presents such complex moral demands that we are driven to seek a wisdom and power beyond our own.

Where else can we turn but to Thee, O God? For Thou alone hast the words of eternal life that give meaning to our mortal years and answer to the questions that taunt us.

Enable us, then, to receive Thy good gift of understanding as we turn to the duties at hand. Cast out the pride and prejudice that could preempt our minds and leave no capacity for thinking Thy thoughts after Thee.

May there be in the deeds and decisions of this day some quality that will yield evidence that we have wrought in the strength of prayer that has been heard on high. We ask it all in the name of Him who taught us to pray. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballero.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 25, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MUNDT TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate returns to the Senate Chamber after the joint session tomorrow, which will be addressed by the distinguished President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be recognized for up to 40 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without

objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 26, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; and

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON MIDDLE EAST PETROLEUM EMERGENCY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, supplemental report relating to the Middle East petroleum emergency, as of October 10, 1967 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC.

A letter from John H. Verkouteren & Co., transmitting a financial report of the Vet-

erans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., for the year ended September 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Cumberland, Md., Aerie No. 245, and the Grand Aerie International Convention, Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against un-American demonstrations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee submitted:

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments: S. 1602. A bill to create a Northwest Regional Services Corporation to provide a central location for various training centers and programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 689).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated October 16, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment-sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RESEARCH IN THE SERVICE OF MAN: BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE"

Mr. HARRIS submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 181) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the com-

mittee print entitled "Research in the Service of Man: Biomedical Knowledge, Development, and Use," which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARRIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STATE UTILITY COMMISSIONS"

Mr. MUSKIE submitted the following original resolution (S. Res. 182); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the committee print of the Committee on Government Operations of the Ninetieth Congress entitled "State Utility Commissions" (a study submitted by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations); and that there be printed two thousand four hundred additional copies for the use of that committee.

CONSUMER PROTECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AREA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills which are designed to enhance substantially the protection of consumers in the District of Columbia. From a number of sources it has come to my attention that a large number of consumers in the District of Columbia, and the entire Washington metropolitan area, are being systematically victimized by a quite small number of retail merchants in the area. Victimization practices are particularly prevalent in connection with retail installment-sales transactions.

At the present time there is no general legislative protection against fraudulent practices in retail installment sales in the District of Columbia, and there is no administrative machinery in the District of Columbia government with a strong, far-reaching mandate to protect consumers in this area. The legislation I introduce today would correct these serious shortcomings.

The beneficial effect of this legislation will not be limited to the protection of residents of the District of Columbia alone, but will extend to the entire Washington metropolitan area. This is so because the legislation will both protect consumers who purchase in the District of Columbia no matter where they reside, and will also significantly influence the practices of merchants in the entire area since consumers will be able to insist generally on the advantages provided to them by this legislation directly in dealing with District of Columbia merchants.

The first bill I introduce would accomplish basically two purposes. First of all, it would provide regulation of numerous aspects of retail installment-sales transactions.

Second, it would establish in the District of Columbia government a Department of Consumer Protection, with a broad mandate to protect consumers against fraudulent or deceptive retail practices, in such areas as advertising, sales, credit contracts, and collection

practices. The Department would be empowered to accomplish this through investigations, administrative hearings and orders, enforcing regulations adopted under this and other consumer protection laws, and through court actions.

Among the many aspects of retail installment contracts which this bill would regulate are the following:

The bill would require broad and detailed disclosure of the terms of consumer credit contracts—the amount of interest charged, the percentage rates of interest, the payment schedules, and so on. These disclosure requirements are similar in effect and purpose to the truth-in-lending legislation which has recently passed the Senate, and by including these disclosure requirements in a bill designed specifically for the District of Columbia, additional, and therefore more effective, enforcement machinery is made available to protect consumers in this area.

The bill would also provide for elimination of the so-called holder in due course doctrine in retail installment sales transactions. This doctrine, as it is presently applied, permits retail sellers to assign their rights to payment under sales contracts to finance companies, so that buyers must pay the full sales price to the finance companies even if the sellers failed to perform their part of the contracts.

If the buyer purchases a television set, for example, which was defective and immediately breaks down, he still must pay the full purchase price to the finance company—the holder in due course—and then initiate suit against the original seller for return of his money. Many consumers lack the means to get any redress in this cumbersome manner and thus get cheated.

Under the bill, the buyer could use his defense against payment to the original seller, also against the finance company to whom the sales contract is assigned. This provision would not limit a seller's ability to obtain financing, since the contract remains assignable. But it would shift the risk that the seller has committed unlawful practices or become insolvent from the consumer to the finance company which is better able to protect its interest against the seller.

The bill also prohibits a number of specific provisions in sales contracts which have in the past been used by a few sellers to take advantage of consumers—provisions such as "balloon payments" which trap unwary consumers into many low payments for a long period of time and a sudden large payment at the end of the term which forces the buyer into default, forfeiting both the goods and all his payments thus far.

The bill also prohibits provisions by which a buyer waives his right to enforce any warranties which the seller may have made concerning the goods. When a buyer purchases goods, typically he believes he is getting a product which will do what the seller says or implies it will do. But in some instances, by signing a small-print contract, the buyer waives his right to enforce this reasonable belief.

The second bill which I am introducing would provide for regulation of finance charges and other charges imposed in

connection with retail installment-sales contracts.

At present, legislation in the District of Columbia regulates maximum interest rates for loan transactions and for automobile credit sales. But there is no regulation of maximum interest rates for consumer credit sales generally. As a result, a few merchants impose sky-high interest rates and other hidden charges, which amount to exorbitant and wholly unreasonable expenses to consumers, all out of proportion to the risks which the sellers are taking and to the returns which reputable businessmen are obtaining in the same kinds of transaction.

This legislation would adopt the same maximum interest rates which are now imposed by law in two States—New York and California—and require that interest charges not exceed 20 percent per annum for the first \$500 and 16 percent per annum for all debt above that amount. In addition, the bill would provide for regulation of credit insurance charges and other charges which are often imposed as disguised forms of interest to avoid maximum statutory interest rates.

This bill is designed to protect consumers, but not to penalize honest, reasonable businessmen. Accordingly, in the course of hearings on this bill—as on all the legislation I introduce today—I intend to explore with great care the experience of other States; such as New York and California, to ensure that the requirements imposed on the business community by this legislation would be both fair and reasonable.

The third bill I introduce establishes a right of consumers, during a limited time period, to cancel retail installment-sales contracts which they have entered. This bill is essentially directed at door-to-door home solicitation sales. A number of reports have indicated that, while the great majority of door-to-door salesmen are reputable and honest, in some circumstances other salesmen engage in high-pressure, deceptive sales techniques which are especially hard for consumers to avoid when they are virtually pursued in their own homes.

Unlike sales transactions in retail stores where the buyer has come seeking out the seller, the person who answers the door at home and is met by a salesman is often less prepared and more vulnerable in dealing with high-pressure and deceptive techniques. Accordingly, I believe it is reasonable to provide a "cooling off" period for such sales, in which the buyer can calmly consider his contract and perhaps consult with members of his family or others about it.

The legislation provides for a 3-day "cooling off" period during which time the buyer can cancel his contract. The cancellation period is the same as is now provided in Massachusetts and Illinois consumer-protection laws. Special account is also made for home-improvement sales contracts, where a seller might act to his detriment by, for example, installing storm windows or making extensive home repairs during the 3-day period, by providing that the buyer must cancel within 3 days or before good-faith performance of any services, whichever is earlier. For all other can-

cellations, provision is made for payment of a small cancellation fee and, of course, return of any goods delivered, to protect the interests of the door-to-door sellers.

The fourth bill I introduce provides that security interests in real property, such as "deeds of trust," can only be foreclosed through court proceedings. A recent series of articles in the Washington Post have revealed a widespread practice which victimizes consumers by persuading them, in effect, to mortgage their homes as security for credit purchases and automatically to forfeit title to their homes if they fail to make any credit payments.

Often the purchaser is misled regarding the effect of the document he signs. Often the purchaser refuses to pay for the goods because they are defective or because he has some other valid defense on the sales contract. But, under present practices, the purchaser still loses his home without any prior opportunity to make a case for himself in court. This bill would prohibit such automatic foreclosures and would require any foreclosure to take place through regular court proceedings where the homeowner would have an opportunity to protect himself.

These four bills were prepared with an intent both to protect consumers and to safeguard the legitimate interests of reputable businessmen—who are the vast majority of merchants in this area. As I have indicated, extensive hearings are necessary, and will be held, to insure that these legislative proposals have in fact accomplished these basic and essential purposes.

The first hearings will be held in the second week in December. A more detailed announcement of the exact coverage of the hearings will be made shortly. I am hopeful that legislation will ultimately result from these efforts which will be a model for consumer protection laws for the rest of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, as follows:

S. 2589. A bill to provide for the regulation in the District of Columbia of retail installment sales of consumer goods (other than motor vehicles) and services, and for other purposes;

S. 2590. A bill to provide maximum finance and other charges in connection with retail installment-credit sales in the District of Columbia;

S. 2591. A bill to provide a right to cancel retail installment sales contracts in the District of Columbia in certain circumstances; and

S. 2592. A bill to amend section 521 of the act approved March 3, 1901, so as to prohibit the enforcement of a security interest in real property in the District of Columbia except pursuant to court order.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Sena-

tor from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 180) seeking U.S. initiative to assure United Nations Security Council consideration of Vietnam conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 26, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and
S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol.

REA IS A SOUND INVESTMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, thousands of words have been spoken in the halls of the Congress recently on the subject of budget cutting and unnecessary spending.

It is therefore refreshing to cite the record of one Federal agency that has proved that funds advanced for financing one Federal program are a sound investment, paying handsome dividends.

The Rural Electrification Administration, in a report on the first 8 months of 1967, has produced figures showing that rural electric and telephone cooperatives are repaying more than \$1 million every day of the loan money advanced to them by the Federal Government.

This cash flow back into the Treasury is the highest level of principal and interest payments in REA's 32-year history.

It is a great tribute to these cooperatives.

Most significant is the fact that REA cooperatives, in an effort to help minimize the net cash demand on our Government, are paying their REA obligations in advance of due dates.

In the last 8 months, a total of \$203 million in interest and principal payments have been made, increasing total electric and telephone payments to more than \$3 billion over the last 32 years.

When we compare this with the total of \$6.6 billion in loan funds actually advanced to all these cooperatives and \$324 million paid ahead of due dates, we see what a healthy investment this has been.

Total electric and telephone repayments of principal over the life of the two programs are \$1.7 billion, and interest paid is more than \$1 billion.

During the last 8 months alone, advance payments back to the Government increased by \$38.2 million.

Electric borrowers, apart from the telephone cooperatives, have repaid \$1.5 billion as principal due, \$883 million in interest, and put \$310 million back into the Treasury ahead of schedule.

These three items total \$2.7 billion, compared with the \$5.4 billion in electric loan funds made available by REA.

Figures for the telephone borrowers show \$145 million paid back on the principal, \$125 million in interest payments, and \$14 million paid in advance of due dates, or a total of \$284 million.

In total, telephone cooperatives have received \$1.2 billion in loan money from REA.

Looking back over the 32 years the electric loan program has been in effect, only two borrowers have defaulted—to the very thin tune of \$44,478.

This is eight ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the loan funds REA advanced, REA statisticians say.

For the 18 years the telephone program has been operating, there has not been a single loss.

Entirely apart from this remarkable record of repayment is the fact that this loan money has been used to generate many added billions of dollars of development in rural areas.

Without this Government capital to assist them, our rural areas would still lack many, many improvements that have encouraged farmers to stay on the farm and that have attracted new enterprise and new residents to the country.

I doubt if any commercial money-lenders could equal the record of development which REA has made possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statistics which have been supplied me by the Rural Electric Administration, at my request, showing the amount of loans advanced, the amount of principal paid, the amount of interest paid, the amount paid in advance, and total payments on a State-by-State basis. I ask unanimous consent, also, to have the same information printed with respect to telephone loans.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA ELECTRIC BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967

State	Loans advanced	Principal paid	Interest paid	Advance payments	Total payments
Alabama	\$131,638,410.36	\$38,907,910.08	\$20,957,723.18	\$6,462,570.76	\$66,328,204.02
Arizona	52,425,931.63	10,021,897.24	6,841,802.34	2,356,793.68	19,220,493.26
Arkansas	171,961,701.62	41,520,143.07	25,999,274.61	4,681,729.95	72,201,147.63
California	37,312,230.85	14,286,069.12	6,870,518.91	129,807.43	21,286,395.46
Colorado	168,187,654.67	34,049,787.36	22,633,042.67	9,347,805.43	66,030,635.46
Connecticut					
Delaware	8,041,005.91	2,427,101.26	1,477,512.71	649,729.48	4,554,343.45
Florida	109,898,274.52	24,639,358.49	15,592,358.50	2,600,700.72	42,832,417.71
Georgia	174,394,440.21	58,698,882.94	29,734,123.12	9,663,507.97	98,096,514.03
Hawaii					
Idaho	30,453,913.44	9,360,172.45	5,300,715.42	786,945.68	15,447,833.55
Illinois	159,013,171.06	47,479,060.33	28,178,334.03	10,304,476.64	85,961,871.00
Indiana	99,362,389.99	39,409,470.51	15,817,066.08	4,864,534.87	60,091,071.46
Iowa	207,364,807.17	69,921,147.35	38,143,941.68	22,630,361.30	30,695,450.33
Kansas	134,654,137.65	43,322,113.39	26,138,022.88	9,197,362.52	78,657,498.79
Kentucky	265,786,103.26	62,626,259.14	38,920,924.04	11,649,187.09	13,196,370.27
Louisiana	105,637,184.36	29,386,897.29	15,145,889.86	9,235,829.72	53,768,616.87
Maine	4,477,091.10	1,283,402.90	839,034.12	2,575.33	2,125,012.35
Maryland	29,210,493.18	8,557,039.00	4,867,664.52	1,699,739.89	15,124,443.41
Massachusetts					
Michigan	98,433,026.04	27,937,935.77	17,767,311.72	1,249,286.22	46,954,533.71
Minnesota	240,884,861.26	79,196,902.62	41,162,877.28	15,439,121.22	35,798,901.12
Mississippi	139,207,839.86	44,013,896.55	24,211,848.29	8,027,373.26	76,253,118.10
Missouri	358,320,263.95	95,913,209.19	61,654,132.80	25,823,830.76	83,691,172.75
Montana	73,051,848.98	22,117,538.22	12,701,467.23	4,867,744.39	39,686,749.84
Nebraska	184,069,684.88	60,338,594.98	35,107,508.61	11,781,382.93	71,076,832.36
Nevada	9,038,147.84	766,559.43	848,617.80	173,346.66	1,788,523.89
New Hampshire	12,889,284.00	2,666,907.60	2,427,029.13		5,093,936.73
New Jersey	2,471,774.55	1,346,316.66	420,016.16	28,252.25	1,794,585.07
New Mexico	118,273,643.51	29,473,489.07	17,218,508.65	9,848,927.09	56,540,924.81
New York	6,791,922.43	3,752,810.21	1,235,506.67	364,290.44	5,352,607.32
North Carolina	158,361,953.46	51,087,416.97	26,276,099.12	11,614,966.30	88,978,482.39
North Dakota	184,491,727.10	46,100,668.55	28,887,268.96	9,619,336.22	84,607,273.73
Ohio	89,841,284.88	40,426,047.10	17,529,252.43	4,633,685.26	62,588,984.79
Oklahoma	219,149,858.83	54,506,257.97	35,345,230.85	10,216,858.89	100,068,347.70
Oregon	66,613,509.91	18,195,634.84	10,814,641.48	3,428,597.51	30,438,887.83
Pennsylvania	58,958,290.11	18,967,028.42	11,174,737.70	2,326,794.97	32,468,561.09
Rhode Island					
South Carolina	142,145,553.27	36,556,762.91	21,005,839.34	4,923,536.52	62,486,138.77
South Dakota	124,083,752.90	35,792,156.62	22,263,814.99	7,876,595.07	65,932,566.68
Tennessee	139,977,927.46	55,665,043.69	24,664,730.61	10,866,243.93	91,196,018.23
Texas	496,042,933.96	132,769,071.18	75,797,844.61	40,167,961.54	248,734,877.33
Utah	24,111,391.42	5,516,172.84	3,435,510.68	170,393.59	9,122,077.11
Vermont	7,530,201.94	2,727,772.65	1,362,116.91	31,149.16	4,121,038.72
Virginia	99,573,343.14	29,448,085.78	18,543,364.70	2,701,474.23	50,692,924.71
Washington	60,790,710.83	19,981,082.85	10,096,862.06	1,880,076.10	31,880,021.01
West Virginia	1,773,351.15	703,560.09	446,227.47	30,245.40	1,180,032.96
Wisconsin	167,907,264.19	51,342,597.49	29,760,763.98	12,802,263.30	20,223,859.73
Wyoming	47,718,583.78	13,363,195.39	8,027,682.79	4,530,872.95	93,905,624.77
Alaska	100,028,927.98	10,175,208.16	9,399,388.40	649,263.17	25,921,751.13
Virgin Islands	430,125.72	430,125.72	57,917.68		1,961,919.25
Puerto Rico	75,040,000.00	9,476,000.00	10,143,919.25		
Total	5,397,821,930.31	1,536,650,761.43	883,245,987.02	310,259,527.79	2,730,156,276.24

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA TELEPHONE BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967

Alabama	\$42,831,033.00	\$3,974,516.37	\$4,157,444.81	\$420,326.85	\$8,552,288.03
Arizona	10,473,042.00	767,254.27	903,487.98	79,770.68	1,750,512.93
Arkansas	23,254,271.64	2,080,542.34	2,300,496.07	5,635.79	4,386,674.20
California	21,627,204.00	2,352,448.05	2,452,580.79	36,457.31	4,841,486.15
Colorado	7,782,356.74	1,112,905.13	958,564.93	10,189.99	2,081,660.05
Connecticut					
Delaware					
Florida	25,796,971.09	3,730,693.28	2,863,072.20	10,478.20	6,604,243.68
Georgia	58,608,986.40	7,075,974.21	5,782,154.18	101,741.18	12,959,869.57
Hawaii					
Idaho	7,359,449.79	940,098.00	808,903.42	139,964.52	1,888,965.94
Illinois	41,558,998.17	5,398,826.87	4,977,028.28	679,307.91	11,055,163.06
Indiana	21,372,035.51	3,318,027.92	2,417,212.49	145,367.81	5,880,608.22
Iowa	43,861,678.72	4,269,297.24	4,511,390.02	832,329.96	9,613,017.22
Kansas	54,568,779.88	7,094,755.70	6,853,641.00	555,329.83	14,503,726.53
Kentucky	55,818,903.23	6,309,131.74	6,110,940.60	290,087.63	12,710,159.97
Louisiana	24,899,828.38	3,398,692.20	2,952,860.88	222,994.06	6,574,547.14
Maine	8,305,180.00	995,790.62	911,132.13	125,360.77	2,032,283.52
Maryland	836,334.00	32,080.50	57,347.87		89,428.37
Massachusetts	477,000.00	70,670.59	60,458.63		131,129.22
Michigan	17,004,986.73	1,767,770.06	1,791,772.67	239,463.50	3,799,006.23
Minnesota	50,129,423.07	6,953,188.33	6,329,473.42	923,052.64	14,205,714.39
Mississippi	14,594,349.00	1,439,612.04	1,454,003.18	50,894.99	2,944,510.21
Missouri	59,541,367.20	6,749,803.29	6,498,788.78	607,342.51	13,855,934.58
Montana	21,093,604.00	4,324,903.08	2,490,582.38	653,259.65	7,468,745.11
Nebraska	13,776,350.43	1,471,163.87	1,377,802.80	252,829.90	3,101,796.75
Nevada	1,689,392.00	163,168.23	132,059.36	48,855.16	344,082.75
New Hampshire	1,268,363.00	116,089.11	134,557.28	302.11	250,948.50
New Jersey	6,022,304.00	582,293.65	592,220.16	74,801.08	1,249,314.89

LOANS, ADVANCES, AND PAYMENTS—REA TELEPHONE BORROWERS—BY STATES, AS OF AUG. 31, 1967—Continued

State	Loans advanced	Principal paid	Interest paid	Advance payments	Total payments
New Mexico	\$6,206,314.00	\$885,836.71	\$804,385.29	\$12,424.20	\$1,702,646.20
New York	7,829,689.00	567,608.09	696,419.66	2,164.31	1,266,192.06
North Carolina	51,479,053.00	4,259,017.12	4,418,694.25	1,360,740.05	10,038,451.42
North Dakota	45,016,622.03	11,236,156.09	5,325,031.06	1,099,287.72	17,660,474.87
Ohio	2,963,102.14	395,982.99	362,927.86	53,005.58	811,916.43
Oklahoma	43,393,440.94	3,678,760.90	3,922,418.47	670,819.05	8,271,994.42
Oregon	14,983,811.45	5,209,677.99	1,833,516.07	73,711.03	7,116,905.09
Pennsylvania	30,404,062.00	3,435,863.53	3,137,343.21	263,249.06	6,836,455.80
Rhode Island	36,951,713.18	3,856,322.76	3,245,480.98	591,140.15	7,692,943.89
South Carolina	19,598,085.00	3,029,776.84	2,543,681.92	352,953.15	5,926,411.91
South Dakota	47,775,369.41	6,083,848.54	5,665,538.19	438,356.94	12,187,743.67
Tennessee	101,555,316.38	12,536,204.07	11,236,744.90	1,557,086.21	25,330,035.18
Texas	6,082,263.39	1,821,961.24	644,505.17	73,776.70	2,466,466.41
Utah	976,444.00	52,787.04	73,776.70	362,616.21	126,563.74
Vermont	20,548,925.00	1,827,685.61	1,855,656.96	362,616.21	4,045,958.78
Virginia	13,801,051.90	2,876,192.58	1,662,126.03	134,460.28	4,672,778.89
Washington	15,386,331.91	1,399,316.19	1,644,674.06	849,577.06	3,043,980.25
West Virginia	53,899,076.67	5,242,121.20	5,605,159.18	12,416.20	11,696,857.44
Wisconsin	2,896,842.30	387,954.13	334,224.94	52,310.18	734,595.27
Wyoming	2,135,738.00	197,870.50	203,388.67		453,569.35
Alaska					
Virgin Islands					
Puerto Rico					
Total	1,158,435,443.68	145,470,640.81	125,095,669.88	14,302,461.41	284,958,772.10

Mr. AIKEN. One other point occurs to me, Mr. President. We sometimes hear that the corporate utility companies can charge much lower rates than the REA. Well, there are two reasons for this: not only that the REA serves territory considered too thin to be attractive to the corporate utilities, but also, when the REA borrows money, it must pay the money back when it is due. However, in many instances when the utility companies borrow money by issuing bonds, and they become due, the companies re-issue the bonds or borrow more money with which to pay them. Therefore, they can service areas for less than can the cooperatives serving the more sparsely settled sections of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, one of the fathers, if not the father, of REA, has seen fit to put this information in the RECORD.

I think that these farmer-owned and farmer-managed cooperatives have performed a great service to the rural population of this country. As a matter of fact, they came into existence only because private utilities would not undertake the risk envisaged in extending lines and service to sparsely populated areas; an endeavor that would yield little or no income for the companies concerned.

One factor that should be kept in mind about REA endeavors is the amount of business they are responsible for in the East and Midwest through the purchase of electrical equipment. It is my strong belief that companies such as General Electric, Westinghouse, and the like, owe a great deal to the REA for generating business inuring to the benefit of these private commercial interests. The fact is, REA's have done much to help the private sector of our economy.

Mr. President, again I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Montana. There is no question but what the REA has done as much or more to develop resources and increase the economy

of this country than any other Federal agency.

I was looking for the record of payments from the State of Montana, for the benefit of the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I find they paid back \$5.5 million on their REA electric and telephone loans in advance of the time they became due. I think that all the cooperatives have been encouraged to do that this year by the Treasury of the Federal Government. They wanted to get all the money they could in as short a time as possible.

VIETNAM—HOW NOT TO UTILIZE AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, now that the airfield at Phuc Yen has finally been struck, and because of statements made by those who have believed that airpower and naval power should not be used to full advantage in this war, I ask unanimous consent that a colloquy in the testimony between the counsel of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee and Maj. Gen. Gilbert Meyers, who directed these air operations in Vietnam for some 15 months, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY BY MAJ. GEN. GILBERT L. MEYERS, USAF, RETIRED, BEFORE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE, AUGUST 29, 1967

PHUC YEN AND ENEMY AIRFIELDS

Mr. KENDALL. Let me ask this, General, so we will have the complete picture.

As far as your headquarters was concerned, were the more important targets recommended for strike, or were your recommendations influenced or inhibited in any way by the feeling that they would not get approval; that you had recommended them before and you were wasting your time and would make waves by continuing to recommend them?

General MEYERS. Well, I think that this influenced our day-to-day recommendations, let's say, but overall, of course, we knew that we had recommended these targets, and that they were on the list, and that if they saw fit to let us hit them, they would. But obviously we did not think it was a good strategy to keep needing them by asking to hit the Phuc Yen Airfield, for example, every time we put in the target list. We had done that many times before and we knew that request was still on the record.

Now on the matter of the airfield, if I could develop that for a moment, I realize that the enemy air in North Vietnam did not pose a very serious threat to our air operations. However, I think one facet of that operation has never been quite understood, and that is that it was always a potential threat to our strike forces. As a result, we were forced to schedule combat air patrols, or fighter sweeps, every time we went on a strike mission.

These missions represented a large number of airplanes. It was a defensive technique which we had to use because if our fighter-bombers got shot down, we were always in serious difficulties answering why. To protect that force, to protect our own pilots, we had to provide them with air cover.

Literally thousands of sorties have been flown on these CAP missions that could have been flown with bombs had these Mig airplanes been eliminated from the scene. Again, this is another illustration of how our air resources were not being the most effectively utilized to carry the war to the enemy.

Mr. KENDALL. Were the airfields recommended for strike by your headquarters?

General MEYERS. Yes, sir.

ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on October 12, 1967, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] addressed the Arkansas Basin Development Association Convention in Wichita, Kans.

His speech at this sixth annual meeting defined most clearly the proper development and management of our available water resources to assure the fulfillment of all our imperative and rapidly expanding water needs.

We are grateful Senator MAGNUSON should come to Kansas and give us the benefit of his deep and rich knowledge of this most vital field. I ask unanimous

consent that his address on October 12 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON, AT THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, WICHITA, KANS.

I am delighted to be here for your 6th Annual Meeting. In the comparatively short span of its life, this Association has built a fine reputation for concerted, aggressive action in support of a comprehensive program of water resources conservation and development for the Arkansas Basin in Kansas. And, of course, many of you individually have been prime movers in this field for many long years. I am sure you will all continue to put forth farsighted, vigorous, and sustained efforts. There is so much to be done! How well you succeed in doing it will have a most important bearing on how well this fine part of our country—and the Nation-at-large—is able to meet the challenge of the critical years which lie ahead.

One of the most urgent concerns throughout the Nation today—and one of our most formidable tasks—is the proper development and management of our available water resources to ensure the fulfillment of all our imperative and rapidly expanding water-related needs. Not only is our population growing at an explosive rate, but the per capita demand for water is also rising sharply. One reason is the increasing concentration of population in urban areas, which are the most difficult to supply. Another is the fact that we are becoming more and more dependent upon industrial production, which requires enormous quantities of water.

Some years ago it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the chairmanship of your good friend and mine, the late Senator Kerr. Our Committee conducted a very exhaustive assessment of long-range national needs. The projections made at that time clearly indicate the magnitude of the problem that confronts us—and it may well be that the course of events will prove them to be too low rather than too high.

It was shown that our overall demand for water will probably triple within the next 20 years, and in many urban areas might increase as much as ten-fold. It was estimated, for example, that three industries alone—steel, paper, and chemicals—might require four times the amount of water that public and private utilities were then supplying to all domestic and industrial users combined throughout the United States. We must remember that something like 65,000 gallons of water are used to make a ton of steel, 90,000 gallons to make a ton of ordinary bond paper, and 200,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic fiber. It was also foreseen that by 1980 thermal power plants throughout the Nation will require an amount of cooling water greatly in excess of the average flow of the mighty Mississippi at St. Louis. The tremendous quantity of hot water returned to our rivers from these plants will create new problems due to the adverse effects of high temperatures on water quality and aquatic life.

A new nationwide program, involving the coordinated efforts of all Federal, State, and local agencies concerned in the water resources field, as well as civic groups and private interests, is now underway which eventually will provide an up-to-date inventory of all our country's water resources, and the general framework of action which should be taken to meet, insofar as possible, all our future water-related requirements. The Congress is now considering the establishment of a National Water Commission to consider the entire range of present

and future water problems and explore all practicable solutions.

Although the overall supply of fresh water which nature provides is strictly limited, it is considered sufficient to meet our needs through the foreseeable future if we use it wisely. Part of our problems arise from the fact that the natural supply is very unevenly distributed by nature. Through effective comprehensive water resources development we can largely compensate for this maldistribution. For one thing, we can store up flood flows in reservoirs so that adequate water will be available when and where we need it.

The importance of water quality control is sharply increasing. Pollution has become a major national problem. It is making much of our precious water unfit for use. Even with the highest efficiency in waste treatment we can hope to obtain, there will be a large measure of pollution which can only be dealt with through sufficient augmentation of our streams during low flow periods to maintain acceptable water quality. This means that throughout the Nation we must reserve part of the runoff of our rivers to serve this purpose.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Sub-committee on Public Works, I have a front seat at the unfolding drama of accomplishment by the Corps of Engineers, the Interior and Agriculture departments, State agencies, and local interests—all working closely together toward the fulfillment of our water requirements. I am continually impressed by how many people of real vision and solid purpose in all parts of our country are actively engaged in this effort—how vigorously and effectively they are working, as you are working, for realistic development programs which will enable their localities to step out strongly in the parade of national progress.

It is one important function of water resources development in a growing country such as ours to open up new areas of opportunity where young people can settle and apply their energies and initiative to the building of a good life. The engineer's transit and slide rule are truly the weapons of the modern frontiersmen.

Such new areas of opportunity are sorely needed.

Almost three-fourths of our people are city dwellers today, and each year almost three million more, seeking jobs they cannot find elsewhere, are joining their ranks. Sprawling, congested urban-industrial complexes are expanding at a phenomenal rate. Within their steel and concrete confines we find most of our serious environmental health hazards, and the conditions that breed social conflict and crime. They are the major polluters of our streams and lakes. One of these megalopolis—or strip cities—now stretches all along the Atlantic coast from Washington, D.C. to Boston—a span of well over 600 miles. Some 18 similar unwieldy concentrations are mushrooming in other parts of the country—along the western and southern shores of Lake Michigan, for instance . . . in the Detroit area . . . along Lake Erie . . . in the Upper Ohio Valley . . . on the southern California coast . . . to name a few of them.

Shall this blighting migration of our growing population to the megalopolis continue unabated? Or shall we, through the comprehensive development of the full potential of our river basins, provide the means to reverse it—to revitalize the towns and villages and rural areas of our countryside, encourage the building of new self-sustaining communities, and make possible a more satisfying, more truly productive life for the oncoming millions of Americans?

In my part of the country, progressive comprehensive development of the Columbia River for flood control, power, navigation, irrigation, and other purposes affords a good example of what can be accomplished. It has paced and supported tremendous economic

expansion. Abundant, low cost electric energy sparked the establishment of the Basin's great aluminum industry, and many other new manufacturing enterprises, businesses, and commercial activities throughout the region. Irrigation has already brought productivity to hundreds of thousands of acres of good but formerly dry land, providing bountiful opportunities for the creation of prosperous family farms, new businesses, and affluent new communities. Slackwater navigation is also helping to open up new areas of opportunity by providing low-cost transportation to serve the needs of agriculture and waterside industry. When the Snake River dams now under construction by the Corps of Engineers are completed, barge navigation will be open from the Pacific Ocean 480 miles upstream to Clarkston, Washington, and Lewiston, Idaho. Booming recreational use of the lakes created to conserve the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries is becoming an asset of increasing importance to the whole region, both in terms of economic advantage and the well-being of its people.

The Arkansas Basin is on the verge of a similar transformation. Of the 42 reservoirs in the Basin's active program, 20 have already been placed in operation. Five of them are located here in southern Kansas. Ten more—one of them, Marion, in your immediate area—are under construction, and two of these, including Marion, will be completed in 1968. Of the remaining reservoirs, funds for completion of planning are available on four, and planning is underway on three others. These reservoirs are conserving water for municipal supply, navigation, quality improvement, irrigation, and all other beneficial uses. They have already prevented over \$172 million flood losses—and in the meantime have become a water playground—13 million visitors last year, of which over 1,700,000 were hosted by your five reservoirs. The Corps of Engineers expects to have the 450-mile canalization of the Arkansas up to the vicinity of Tulsa completed by 1970. Substantial progress has already been made toward the development of ports and industrial parks along the river—the non-Federal facilities needed to attract and sustain large-scale private enterprise.

You people of southern Kansas have made it clear that you are going to continue to plan and work for the further development of your part of the great Arkansas Basin in order to realize its full potential. Much will depend upon the skill and vigor with which you plan for the future. You have a number of important advantages over some of the older developed areas. For one thing, you have the advantage of their experience, the lessons of their oversights and shortcomings. Here in southern Kansas you have extensive space, rivers, ground water, and other resources not yet put to full use. You still have plenty of opportunity to avoid over-concentrations of population, wasteful abuses of resources, and uncoordinated development which works at cross-purposes.

You have the opportunity to preserve and enhance a better balance between man and nature than can ever be achieved by some older areas which have allowed that balance to be destroyed. You can select, from among your streams and valleys and hills and plains, those which are to be developed for productive use and those which are to be left undeveloped for other, perhaps less economical, but equally essential uses—for example, the preservation of the natural environment and the conservation of fish and wildlife.

I am happy to see that the Corps of Engineers is investigating the feasibility of extending navigation into this area by two routes—up the Verdigris and Arkansas to the vicinity of this city, and by way of the Grand (Neosho). If such a waterway should be found feasible and built, it would provide you with the means of getting your wheat to the sea by low-cost barge transportation,

and in other ways would be of real advantage in promoting the further economic development of southern Kansas. We in the Columbia Basin are seeking a similar extension of our navigation system from the present head of navigation on the lower Columbia to Wenatchee, Washington, in order that the interests of the interior of the State might be better served.

Although a high priority item on your agenda is the completion of the authorized program in this area, undoubtedly optimum development of its water resources to meet expanding needs will eventually—a few decades from now if not earlier—require many more reservoirs than those now included in that program, and that fact should be taken into full consideration in all your planning.

In too many places throughout the country, when the requirement for more reservoirs has become critically manifest, it has been discovered too late that the best sites have already been preempted by residential and industrial development and are out-of-bounds economically. Don't let that happen to you! Adequate sites ought to be identified as far as possible in advance of the need for them, and timely action taken to reserve them for future water conservation. Your positive leadership in this effort will pay high dividends in years to come.

Here in southern Kansas you have the water and the good land which could make it one of our Nation's greatest areas of expanding opportunity—a powerful magnet to help slow and reverse the migration of our population to the megalopolis. But it will never be enough to sit back and say: "Here are all the potential advantages that developed water resources can confer on an individual and a community. Here are the good water and the fruitful land—come and get them."

Little will really be accomplished unless local initiative is employed to the maximum extent in a positive program to create jobs and businesses which will attract people to the region—to undertake the actual building of new communities where people can come and make a good living and at the same time live a good life—communities which might well be based on your fine reservoirs. Your own vigorous and farsighted enterprise is the real key to the future. With everyone working together in a cooperative spirit, there is no limit to what can be accomplished in the Arkansas Basin in Kansas. Your Association has a busy and rewarding role to play in mobilizing and fostering such participation and cooperation. I am fully confident that you will continue to play it well.

NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE ON RURAL YOUTH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEARSON

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this morning I had the opportunity of addressing the National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth on the subject of Revitalizing Rural America: Problems and Promises.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech I delivered on this date, October 26, 1967, in Washington, D.C., at the Departmental Auditorium, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA: PROBLEMS AND PROMISES

(Statement by Senator JAMES B. PEARSON at National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth, October 26, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

First let me say what a pleasure it is for me to have the opportunity to appear before

you this morning as a participant in the National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth. Second, I want to commend the Department of Agriculture and the other Departments of the Executive Branch for taking the initiative in sponsoring this most worthwhile conference. As a Member of Congress and also as a member of the minority party I often find myself in disagreement with the Executive Branch. Therefore, it is particularly gratifying when we find ourselves on common ground.

The theme of this conference is, "New Prospects for Rural Youth." And I would suggest that the most promising new prospect for rural youth is the growing national commitment to the revitalization of rural America. It is too early to tell precisely where this new commitment will take us, but there is no mistaking the fact that there is growing national consensus on the need to stimulate the social and economic development of rural communities.

Rural America has been plagued with problems for a good many years, but ironically it is the great trouble in the urban rather than the rural areas which has finally caused us to more clearly see and understand the difficulties of the countryside and small towns.

The headlines of the past two or three years have made all of us painfully aware of the gigantic social and economic problems of urban America. And the term, "crisis of the cities" has come into common usage—a crisis described in terms of festering slums, rising crime rates, disintegrating families, chronic unemployment, racial tension, congested streets, polluted air and contaminated water.

We have now begun to recognize that many of these problems can be traced to the overcrowding of people and the excessive concentration of industry into a few great metropolitan centers. We are now beginning to realize that one of the most sensible and effective approaches to dealing with the crisis of the cities is to devise programs which will have the effect, hopefully, of slowing down or at least better controlling the great rural to urban migration which has for several decades continued to depopulate the countryside and small towns and to swell the population of our already overcrowded cities.

The long, hot urban summer of 1967 has proven to be something of a catalyst, and we have begun to accept the idea that as we attempt to deal with the crisis of the cities the challenge is not simply to make the cities more efficient and more livable for more and more people, but how to keep more and more people from crowding into them.

Increasingly we are coming to realize that the old assumption that the migration from the country to the city represents the first step up the ladder of economic opportunity and social advancement simply isn't valid. For in reality far too many of the rural poor have crowded into the deteriorated sections of the large cities where they have become entrapped by their own lack of skills and by the pressure from the surrounding communities which seek to isolate the slum population in physical ghettos. What was to be their economic salvation became their prison, and ill-equipped to resist the depersonalizing forces of the city, their sense of personal and social responsibility is dulled. As the darkness of despair crowds out the light of hope they are demoralized and devoured by the contagion of their slum environment.

The rural exodus is not, of course, composed only of the poor and unskilled. It also includes the talented youth and the highly educated. And because of this the rural communities are being bled of their best human talent and most productive economic resources, in a cycle that continually feeds upon itself: the loss of people means a loss of local income and the gap between the actual tax base and the costs of public services is widened. Rural communities are already stretched to the limit to provide the public resources to educate their children, but after

they have been educated the youth move to other areas because of a lack of local economic opportunity and social amenities.

But this in turn magnifies the problem because it is the talented and educated youth who could best provide the initiative and leadership to revitalize the community. Ironically, the rural areas are subsidizing the cities by the continuing export of their educated youth.

Thus, we have begun to see the whole question of our rural-urban balance in a new perspective. And because more and more people are dissatisfied with what they see we are now in the early stages of a national debate centering on the question of how we can better control and moderate the great rural migration to the cities. This debate will continue for several years and it will provide us an opportunity to discuss the characteristics of our present society and to raise fundamental questions about the type of society we want to build in the future. I am confident that out of this national debate will come a series of public policy decisions which will have a major influence on the development of our society for several decades to come. Hopefully those policy decisions will be the correct ones.

This then is the promise of the commitment to the goal of revitalizing rural America. Now let me turn to some of the problems that will be encountered as we seek to translate this general goal into practical reality.

The basic problem, I think, is represented by the challenge of the long-held beliefs and notions about what constitutes economic and social development. Despite the growing national acceptance of the idea that the rural to urban shift has gotten out of hand, I don't think we have really come to grips with many of the fundamental questions which we are going to have to deal with. For example, despite the uneasiness about the continuing concentration of people and economic resources into relatively few highly urbanized areas, we still tend to assume that the social and economic forces which underlie this concentration are not only inevitable but basically desirable over the long run. In short, we are still something of two minds on this subject. Our doubts about the undesirable effects of massive urbanization tend to be counterbalanced by a general expression of a century-old article of faith that this overall movement toward a highly concentrated, urbanized society represents economic and social progress.

And, of course, it is true that the forces which underlie the rural to urban migration do represent progress in a very meaningful sense. But the massive and hideous slums and the deteriorating rural communities which are the product of these forces are damning testimony to our inability to diffuse this progress throughout the entire population.

Thus, what I want to emphasize here is that if we are going to do anything more than pay lip service to the idea of achieving a more desirable rural-urban balance, we are going to have to discard many of our attitudes and traditional dogmas and take a completely new look at the forces which have shaped our present social and economic structure.

In this effort to overcome these old stereotyped attitudes and beliefs, it is absolutely vital that we develop the best possible information and data. We already know a great deal, but we need to know a great deal more. We need to know in more precise detail those factors which influence industrial plant location. We need to know more about what conditions are necessary to assure efficient operations of industries outside our metropolitan areas. We need to know more about the economic costs and inefficiencies associated with the concentration of people and economic resources in the giant metropolitan

complexes. We need to know more about why people migrate from one area to another. We need to know more about the human and natural resources that are currently available throughout rural communities of America. In short, we need a vast array of new data and theoretical explanations concerning the whys and hows of economic growth and population distribution.

This is one of the reasons why I think this conference is so valuable because one of its purposes is to encourage the dissemination of information and data that we now have and to emphasize the importance of future studies and analyses and the continuing exchange of this information among both governmental and non-governmental groups which are interested in this whole question of rural economic development.

Now, in the concluding portion of my remarks, I want to identify some of the specific steps that I think should be taken as a part of this effort to revitalize our rural communities.

First, and most obvious, rural areas need more jobs. Unless we can actually begin to increase the number of jobs available in our rural communities, nothing else that we can do will have any meaningful or lasting effect. In this connection, I would just like to briefly mention the Rural Job Development bill introduced by Senator Harris and myself in July of this year. This bill provides a series of tax incentives designed to attract new job-creating industries into rural communities. I am, of course, pleased to note that the bill has been extremely well received in the Congress and we have been most encouraged by the expression of support we have received from all around the country. I am most hopeful that we can get early and favorable action on this piece of legislation.

Second, we must expand educational opportunities in rural areas, particularly those types of programs involving vocational-technical training. New industries can survive in rural communities only if they are able to count upon a skilled labor force.

Third, we need a better system of making credit available to business firms which are interested in developing a new enterprise in rural areas. The type of capital that is needed to finance new industries is oftentimes simply not available outside the large metropolitan areas.

Fourth, we have got to substantially improve the quantity and quality of available housing. One of the first problems that smaller towns encounter in their efforts to attract new industry is a shortage of housing.

Fifth, the Federal Government must do a better job than it is now doing to achieve a more equitable geographical distribution in the spending and procurement programs. This is particularly important in regard to the awarding of research and development grants to the colleges and universities. The present pattern of distribution of funds actually tends to encourage the concentration of people, talent and economic resources in a relatively few areas. This is no reason whatsoever why more of these grants can't go to the small regional and community colleges. The strengthening of these institutions will have many indirect but important ramifications throughout the surrounding community.

Sixth, we must stop treating the problems of rural and urban areas as separate and distinct. Although manifested in different ways, the problems are interrelated and have common causes. Thus, it is essential that we develop more effective coordination of Federal Government programs—particularly those concerned with economic development and the reduction of poverty.

And seventh we must rededicate ourselves to a fresh, new effort to strengthen the institution of the family farm. I want to stress this point because a number of people who

are stressing the need for a better rural-urban balance are saying that the continuing exodus from the farm cannot be stopped, and, in effect, I think, have written off the family farm as a viable institution. Now it would be neither possible or desirable to attempt to freeze the farm population at the present level, but to argue that we can't do anything to substantially alter the present trend is the very same type of economic fatalism which we have got to overcome if we are ever going to make any substantial progress toward a better rural-urban balance. We must strengthen the family farm not only because it is a valuable socioeconomic institution but because it is the base on which so many of our smaller towns and cities depend.

These are some of the things that we need to do now. But as the debate on how to achieve a more sensible rural-urban balance continues, hopefully new proposals will be generated. And in this connection I would close by urging each and every one of you to renew your efforts on behalf of rural youth and to help stimulate discussion at the local level as to what individual citizens and private groups, as well as governmental agencies, can do to broaden the social and economic opportunities of rural America and thereby improve the quality of American society. Your work is absolutely vital to this whole effort and I believe you will be rewarded by your direct participation in meeting one of the most demanding, but also exciting, challenges of our time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for as long as may be required for my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAS THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS BECOME "BUY AMERICAN?"

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly, and adversely, on the about-face of the Department of State with respect to the sale of F-5 aircraft to Peru.

When the Peruvians originally approached the United States with a request to buy F-5's some months ago, they were told quite properly that we were opposed to making the sale.

They then went to the British in an attempt to buy some Canberra bombers. The British were prepared to make the sale, but the United States, again quite properly, exercised its rights under the end-use agreement by which British manufacture of the Canberra was licensed, and vetoed that sale.

The Peruvians then went to the French to buy some Mirage V aircraft. At this point, the United States had no leverage left, and the State Department pivoted around 180 degrees from its original position. It told the Peruvians that they could buy F-5's after all, for delivery in 1969-70, which is about what the lead time on F-5's is, anyway.

Now, according to press reports over the weekend, the Peruvian Government, in a crowning ironical culmination of the Department's flip-flop, has politely said "No, thank you" to the United States.

As for the State Department, after having started out following the correct

policy, it has now publicly abandoned its position and, in the process, has infuriated the British, who are the closest and most reliable friends we have left.

The British were understandably annoyed when we vetoed the sale of Canberras, but they recognized that we acted within our legal rights and in pursuance of a policy which, though they disagreed with it, at least up to that point had the virtue of consistency. We have now deserted our own policy, and have as much as said to the British: "We will not allow you to sell Canberras, but we will, ourselves, sell F-5's, in order to block the French."

We have said, in effect, to the Peruvians, and to all the rest of Latin America, "Don't take us too seriously when we talk about the guiding principles of the Alliance for Progress, the urgent need for internal reforms, and rapid economic growth for the benefit of the people, for we don't take all that too seriously ourselves. Our guiding principle, when you come right down to it, is 'Buy American.' Don't believe us if we turn you down the first time, we'll come around in the end if you find another source of supply."

Little wonder that John M. Goshko, Latin American correspondent for the Washington Post, should reply from Lima:

Washington's about-face on the sale of the F-5 has touched off a wave of undisguised chortling in Peruvian political and press circles about what is regarded here as the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the U.S. position.

I ask, Mr. President, that the full text of Mr. Goshko's article may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1967]
PERUVIANS SPURN U.S. OFFER TO SELL F-5
JETS AS TOO LATE
(By John M. Goshko)

LIMA, October 21.—In an effort to forestall Peruvian purchase of French supersonic Mirage jets, the United States has formally offered Peru the U.S. F-5 jet, only to have the proposal rejected.

The action came in the wake of this week's announcement in Washington that the Johnson Administration was reversing its long-standing ban on the sale of F-5s to Latin American countries and would consider Latin purchase requests for delivery in 1969 or 1970.

In Peru's case, it was learned, the initiative went even further. On Thursday, Ernesto Siracusa, charge d'affaires of the U.S. Embassy here, called on President Fernando Belaunde Terry to propose that Peru buy the F-5 instead of the French Mirage.

Belaunde is understood to have replied that although the F-5 was the plane originally desired by the Peruvian Air Force, the U.S. offer came too late. This strengthened the hints dropped in recent days by Peruvian officials that the deal with France already has been concluded.

The general belief here is that the purchase involves 15 or 16 planes. These are supposed to include 12 Mirage fighter-bombers and 3 or 4 Mirage trainers.

Meanwhile, Washington's about-face on the sale of the F-5 has touched off a wave of undisguised chortling in Peruvian political and press circles about what is regarded here as the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the U.S. position. It also is known to have caused

great gloom among U.S. embassy and AID officials who feel the action has seriously undermined their ability to influence the Peruvian government on matters related to the jet deal.

The United States had feared that the acquisition of supersonic planes by one Latin country would spur similar purchases throughout the area and divert money needed for development into a regional arms race.

When it became apparent that the Peruvian government, under heavy pressure from its armed forces, was nevertheless determined to buy supersonic planes, the United States mounted a strenuous effort to prevent the sale. It tied a warning not to buy the planes to negotiations for a loan and even hinted at a possible cutback of other U.S. aid to Peru.

However, Belaunde decided he needed the support of his armed forces even more than he needs U.S. aid. Now, in the wake of reports that at least one other Latin country, Brazil, is negotiating with the French for Mirages, Washington has decided to start selling the F-5 in Latin America.

The apparent justification is that since the United States cannot prevent the introduction of supersonic warplanes into the area, it should become the prime supplier of them. This would make the Latins dependent on the United States for training and for replacement parts, thereby theoretically allowing Washington some control over the plane's employment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at Punta del Este last April, the Presidents of the members of the Organization of American States, including the Presidents of the United States and Peru, joined in a somewhat turgid declaration which nonetheless contains this succinct sentence: "Latin America will eliminate unnecessary military expenditures." No wonder there is a credibility gap—and not just in the United States.

The argument to which the State Department resorts to justify its reversal of policy is that if we do not sell F-5's, the French will sell Mirages. From this, the Department also argues that since the Peruvians are determined to acquire modern jet aircraft, it is better to sell them F-5's, which are cheaper, slower, and generally less sophisticated than Mirages. Finally, it is said that the sale of F-5's preserves U.S. influence with the Peruvian Air Force, maintains the dependence of that air force on the United States for spare parts and training, and prevents the intrusion of French military influence in the area.

None of these arguments holds water. I have not heard anyone seriously dispute the proposition that the acquisition of expensive, sophisticated, modern weapons is a squander of the limited financial resources of Latin American countries; that it is contrary to the goals of the Alliance for Progress, and in conflict with the fundamental objectives of our own foreign policy in this hemisphere, where hundreds of millions of our own dollars are being contributed each year to promote economic growth south of our borders.

It follows that the United States ought not to be supplying expensive, sophisticated military equipment to Latin America.

If the Latin Americans, either through undue influence of their own military establishments or a misperception of

their true self-interest, are nonetheless determined to acquire such equipment from other sources, they must accept the consequences. Peru is a sovereign nation, and can do what it wants to with its own resources. But the United States should not be a party to the squandering of these resources by agreeing to sell Peru, or other poor nations of Latin America, F-5's. To argue, as the State Department does, that otherwise Peru would squander even more resources, is like justifying a sale of marihuana, on the grounds that the purchaser would otherwise buy heroin.

I completely fail to understand the horror with which the Departments of State and Defense view any prospect of an intrusion of European influence in Latin America. One would think they regard the area as the private preserve of the United States. Indeed, many Latin Americans do think they regard it that way, and this is one of the many handicaps under which the United States labors in that part of the world.

Nor, on the other hand, am I at all impressed with the advantages which the United States supposedly gains from its presumed influence with the Latin American military. There may have been an instance in recent years when this influence proved a source of restraint, but it does not readily come to mind.

On the contrary, one of the problems the United States faces in Latin America is its popular identification with the military. If we were to loosen some of these ties, we would disappoint some colonels and even some junta governments, but we would do a great deal to rehabilitate ourselves with the people at large, who are going to have more to say, in the long pull, about the future of Latin America than the colonels.

Finally, Mr. President, it will be interesting to see what the State Department does about supplying economic aid to Peru in the light of these aircraft purchases. Apparently, the Department had decided that it really could not justify an aid program if Peru bought Mirage V's; then subsequently found that it could justify an aid program if she bought F-5's from us. But the F-5 sale is now off, by Peru's choice. Will the Department now revert to a "no more aid" stance?

The Department has thus contrived for itself a conundrum which it will assuredly face not only in Peru, but also in Brazil and other countries, for no one should be so naive as to suppose that if these planes are offered to Peru, we can then avoid offering them to other Latin American countries as well.

Behind the Department's reasoning, there must be the thought that a cutoff of aid could be avoided by selling F-5's, whereas a cutoff could not be avoided if the Peruvians, Brazilians, and others bought Mirages.

This is really the most appallingly cynical part of the whole sordid business. It amounts to saying, "We'll give you aid if you waste your resources on something we sell, but not if you waste them on something others sell." What could be more calculated to destroy faith in the Alliance for Progress and to reinforce

the image of the United States as "Mr. Money Bags?"

It is unfortunate, potentially tragic, that things have reached this pass. I have never believed that the aid program gave us very much leverage anyway, or that we ought to attempt to achieve our objectives by threatening to cut off aid. Such threats usually do no more than give offense to the threatened party and provide him with an added reason to do what he intended to do anyway, just to show his independence. Specifically, I do not believe a threat to cut off aid could have prevented the Peruvian-French deal for Mirages.

However, there is more than one way to get a point across. In the days before the aid program became an all-purpose crutch, diplomats used to have a degree of subtlety and imagination.

Furthermore, the conduct of diplomacy by blackmail works both ways. Just as we should not threaten the Peruvians, we should not allow ourselves to be threatened by them or by nightmare visions of our own making should they choose to disregard our advice.

To sum up: The United States was correct in its first refusal to sell the Peruvians F-5's. It was correct in exercising its rights under the end-use agreement with respect to the British Canberras. But when the Peruvians turned to the French, we should never have resorted to the indignity of reversing our own position and offering them F-5's instead. We should have stuck by our principles, and taken advantage of the occasion to reiterate that, in the administration of our own aid program, we intended to be guided by it.

In this connection, CIAP—the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—has every right, in reviewing Peru's economic development program, to look at how Peru is using its own resources. In negotiating aid programs with Peru, the United States has similar rights. If it appears that Peru, or any other country, is not using its resources wisely, there ought not to be very much aid.

And, if we really want to prevent a new arms race for expensive jet aircraft in Latin America, this it seems to me, would have been the place to take our stand. I daresay it would have had a very sobering effect throughout Latin America if the United States had said plainly to Peru, "Look to the French, if you will, for your jets, and look to them also for your aid."

If we would only take that simple position once and stick to it, I am sure it would have a very salutary effect around the hemisphere. At best, it would reinvigorate the Alliance for Progress. At worst, it would save us a good deal of money. Either way, it would restore our self-respect—and incidentally, make us a good many friends among the little people of the hemisphere.

WHERE ARE THE SONGS?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Vietnam war is the most unpopular war in our Nation's history and the longest excepting the Revolutionary

War. There are no patriotic slogans being bandied about such as "Making the World Safe for Democracy" or "Remember the Maine." Also, the fact that there are no war songs being sung anywhere in America relating to our GI's and air-men fighting in Vietnam is strongly indicative of how unpopular our involvement in this civil war has become. To the contrary, anti-Vietnam war songs are popular among young Americans in some of our universities.

In World Wars I and II, the Spanish-American War, and even in the Mexican War, which was also an unpopular war, there were war songs and parades with bands playing martial music. There is nothing like that in America now. The Vietnam war is as remote to most Americans as a television play. Many Americans neither feel in it nor a part of it. Most do not even relate to it. Sometimes it comes home to us when we read of a youngster we remember as a neighbor boy being killed in combat in Vietnam.

Remember those songs "Keep the Home Fires Burning," "Over There," "Keep Your Head Down, Allemand, If You Want To See Your Father, in the Fatherland," "White Cliffs of Dover," "There's a Long, Long Trail a Winding," "This Is the Army, Mr. Jones," "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition." Nothing of that sort now. Most people do not even seem to miss the \$2.5 billion blown up in smoke each month because leaders of this administration have blundered into a civil war in Vietnam and have converted it into a major American war in the worst area of the world for Americans to fight. South Vietnam, a little country in Southeast Asia far from our sphere of influence—in fact, 10,000 miles distant from mainland United States—is of no economic or strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

VISIT TO CONGRESS TOMORROW BY THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the appearance tomorrow by Mexican President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz before a joint meeting of Congress is put in perspective by an article entitled "Anti-Yankeeism Is Mexican Myth," written by Virginia Prewett, and published in the October 25 issue of the Washington Daily News, and by an article entitled "Warm 'Abrazos' Across the Border," written by William Weber Johnson, and published in the Los Angeles Times of October 26, 1967.

Mr. Johnson is a professor of journalism at UCLA, former foreign correspondent in Mexico and South America, and author of books, magazines, and articles on Latin America.

Miss Prewett in her article quotes pertinent sections of the Mexican Embassy's news release in announcing the visit, and other facets of the visit as well. She writes, in part:

No specific matters are up for discussion as no problems exist at present between Mexico and the U.S. which would warrant it.

What a change, Mr. President, from United States-Mexican relations in the past. Of course, problems continue to ex-

ist, but I am confident the spirit of co-operation which has been nurtured and developed by the leaders of our two countries will also continue to prevail.

Mr. President, we can look with pride to our relationship with Mexico. As a chief architect of this happy situation, President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz is deserving of an attentive and sympathetic audience when he speaks to Congress tomorrow.

I also invite attention to an editorial entitled "Visitor From Mexico," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 24; and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and the two articles to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 25, 1967]

ANTI-YANKEEISM IS MEXICAN MYTH (By Virginia Prewett)

The visit of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico this week, according to the Mexicans themselves, is simply and purely a "friendship visit."

Says the Mexican Embassy's news release of Oct. 17 announcing President Diaz Ordaz's visit: "No specific matters are up for discussion as no problems exist at present between Mexico and the U.S. which would warrant it."

In view of the past U.S.-Mexican history of border warfare, border irritations, accusations of territory-grabbing, expropriation of U.S. properties and all the rest, this pronouncement by the Mexicans is a kind of milestone.

Mexico and the U.S. do have questions pending—that of the ultra-salty waters of the Colorado River that flow into Mexico, for example—but they are being handled in friendly routine fashion.

This development in U.S.-Mexican relations illustrates how our country and its hemisphere neighbors can work out even the most troubling problems when the atmosphere is not poisoned by the ambitions of extra-continental powers, as in Cuba today.

Mexico is one of the most rapidly advancing of the Latin American countries. And U.S. cooperation, beginning notably with World War II, has played a large role in this development.

For in spite of Mexico's much-publicized stance of strict "independence"—a stance constantly dramatized by Mexico's refusal to follow the U.S. example in boycotting Communist Cuba—Mexicans actually have made an immensely good thing out of their relations with the U.S.

In two extremely important economic areas, industrialization and the tourist trade, Mexicans in the past 20 years have welcomed the U.S. contribution.

Hundreds of millions of U.S. capital has flowed into Mexico, to help that country develop to the point of exporting such manufactures as freight cars and seamless steel tubing to the U.S. itself.

Today around a billion and a quarter of U.S. dollars are directly invested in Mexico, nearly \$800 million of it in manufacturing.

This has come about because the Mexican government and Mexican business have discarded the panic fear of U.S. investment that both communists and ultra-nationalists keep alive in many parts of Latin America.

The Mexicans set their own ground rules, and the U.S. investors have proved willing and able to comply. This fact is significant.

Far in advance of other Latin American countries, Mexico set about making their land a most pleasant place for Americans to

visit. The result is around \$850 million spent in Mexico last year in the tourist and across-border trade.

From the above it can be seen that the Mexicans appear to talk an anti-Yankee game, in major aspects their country over the past 20 years has proved quite pro-Yankee.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 26, 1967]

WARM ABRAZOS ACROSS THE BORDER

(By William Weber Johnson)

When President Johnson welcomes Mexico's President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to Washington this week it will be 58 years, almost to the day, since the first meeting of the heads of state of the two nations. There have been some startling changes. In Washington there will be much pleasant pomp, mutual admiration, mutual trust. Business will be transacted forthrightly, with enlightened self interest and recognition of common concerns.

The atmosphere in El Paso, Texas, in October, 1909, was different. President William Howard Taft, returning from a western trip, halted his special train to meet Porfirio Diaz, the stony-faced old dictator who had ruled Mexico for a third of a century.

The occasion was completion of the new international bridge. Diaz, the old soldier, advanced cautiously to the mid-point of the bridge and was escorted to the El Paso Chamber of Commerce. There the two presidents held a brief, private conversation while their aides drank champagne. Then the party adjourned to the customs house in Ciudad Juarez where Taft and Diaz again talked briefly.

The Mexican press reported "there was exchanged *el Handshake*." And that may have been the size of it. Diaz, once much admired in the United States for his hard-fisted maintenance of peace in troubled Mexico and for past favors to U.S. investors, had fallen from grace. Mexico was not cultivating European business interests. Diaz had dragged his feet on renewal of the U.S. Navy's lease of Magdalena Bay. And he had befriended Jose Santos Zelaya, the anti-U.S. dictator of Nicaragua.

Whether any of this was called to old Don Porfirio's attention is not known. But the following year when Francisco Madero launched his anti-Diaz revolution on Texas soil the United States did little to deter him. Within a year the Diaz regime crumbled. Diaz, among others, is credited with the saying: "Poor Mexico, so far from God, so close to the United States."

The following quarter century was a sort of dark ages of Mexican-American relations.

Madero, all ideals and good will, came to power only to be overthrown and assassinated in a conspiracy about which the American ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, knew far more than he should have. Gen. Victoriano Huerta usurped the presidency with Ambassador Wilson's enthusiastic support. But Huerta ran afoul of the new U.S. President, Woodrow Wilson. The upshot was the occupation of Veracruz by U.S. troops, a move which outraged all Mexican sectors, both pro- and anti-Huerta.

When Huerta fell President Wilson tried vainly to unify and pacify the various Mexican revolutionary factions. But these factions, with their old enemy Huerta gone, were by now behaving like fractious tomcats. Only Pancho Villa, the half-genius, half-mad bandit warrior from Chihuahua, seemed friendly to the United States.

The man who emerged from all the confusion, white-bearded old Venustiano Carranza, was finally granted grudging *de facto* U.S. recognition. Pancho Villa was furious and staged his raid on Columbus, N.M. Again U.S. intervention, this time by the Pershing-led Punitive Expedition, angered almost all Mexicans, particularly Carranza.

Carranza was petty and vain, but he was also a sincere and stubborn nationalist. Soon he was flirting with imperial Germany to the discomfiture of the United States, which was on the brink of entering World War I. Germany, eager to prevent U.S. entry into the war, proposed an alliance; Mexico would be rewarded with restoration of the lands she had lost to the United States in the war of 1846-48—the southwestern states. Whether Carranza considered it seriously or not, he pulled back from the entanglement at the last minute. But the tide of anti-gringoism was running high. On ceremonial occasions in Mexico City the American ambassador would be hissed and booed, the German minister greeted with cheers.

Matters did not begin to mend appreciably until Ambassador Dwight Morrow helped President Plutarco Elias Calles sort some order out of the economic wreckage of the Revolution. Franklin D. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy and the relaxed, sympathetic approach of Ambassador Josephus Daniels continued the healing process. The first severe test of the rapprochement came at the time of Mexico's oil expropriation in 1938. Another came with Pearl Harbor. Mexico, under the leadership of Manuel Avila Camacho, entered the war on the side of the United States. It was the beginning of a new era of close cooperation.

In April, 1943 President Roosevelt interrupted a secret tour of U.S. military bases to go to Monterrey for a meeting with Avila Camacho. The next day they resumed their conversation at the U.S. Navy Air Base in Corpus Christi, Texas, where hundreds of young Mexicans were receiving pilot training.

"We have all of us," said Mr. Roosevelt, "recognized the principle of independence. It is time we recognize also the privilege of interdependence, one upon another."

The "privilege of interdependence" has been the guiding spirit of the 12 Mexican-American presidential meetings which have since taken place. Such meetings can never be commonplace. But they have, with increasing frequency, become expectable and fruitful.

Major problems of finance, trade, migrant labor, territorial claims (such as the old and troublesome Chamizal dispute) and international water policies have been worked out to the benefit of both sides. With sympathy and support from both public and private sectors of the United States, Mexico has become a model of stability in the traditionally unstable world of Latin America.

Her currency is firm. She is maintaining a phenomenal 6% economic growth rate to keep up with her booming population. In the process Mexico has become the United States' best customer in Latin America, buying twice as much from us as from the rest of the world. Cooperation has replaced intervention as a means of international adjustment.

There remain, and perhaps always will remain, areas of disagreement, as in the countries' respective attitude toward Castro's Cuba. But the differences are overshadowed by the demonstrable fact that two neighboring nations, so different in many respects, can find so much in common.

When Richard Nixon, then vice-president, returned from his unhappy trip to South America, he advised President Eisenhower that in dealing with Latins one should greet enemies with a handshake, friends with an *abrazo*, a hearty, back-slapping hug. Mr. Eisenhower and the Presidents who followed him all became adept at the *abrazo*—none more so than Lyndon B. Johnson, who comes from country Mexicans and Americans once fought over so bitterly. And, happily, *el Handshake* of the Taft-Diaz meeting seems to be gone for good in the area of Mexican-American relations.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
Oct. 24, 1967]

VISITOR FROM MEXICO

When President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz of Mexico visits the United States this week, the occasion might remind "North" Americans that Mexico today is the largest Spanish-speaking power in the world, and the third largest nation of the New World. Many United States citizens today are well acquainted with their southern neighbor, yet it still is not always easy to appreciate the growth of the republic in population, in economic wealth and in progressive and stable government. Mexico demands attention and respect.

What brings President Diaz Ordaz to this country suggests that this was, unfortunately, not always the case. In 1852 the great Mexican liberator, President Benito Juarez, asked the United States to return several hundred acres of land near El Paso separated from Mexico by boundary river changes. This country largely ignored the claim, and in 1911 even rejected an arbitration award to Mexico. But this weekend, after the Mexican President addresses a joint meeting of Congress in Washington, he and President Johnson will formally exchange El Chamizal (the big thicket) in ceremonies in El Paso. This will culminate years of bargaining and a congressional agreement to compensate Americans losing their land.

From the standpoint of history and national pride, El Chamizal is more important to Mexico than to the United States, and the latter owes and can afford generosity in settlement. Beyond that the visit of Mexico's President represents a new measure of mutual respect between neighbors.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 660, and that the rest of the measures on the calendar, up to a certain point, be considered in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CAREERS OF FEMALE OFFICERS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5894) to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove provisions of law which limit the promotion opportunity for, and restrict the career tenure of, women officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. Fundamentally, the purpose of the bill is to remove inconsistent and inequitable legislative restrictions on the career opportunities available to our women officers. There is no logical reason why women in the Armed Forces may not have the same promotion and career tenure opportunities as those available to male officers.

The law that originally established women's components in the Armed Forces provided limitations on the grade to which female officers could rise, and the number that could serve in the more

senior grades. This law also provided mandatory retirement provisions which were generally more restrictive than those applicable to male officers.

With but a few exceptions, these limitations and restrictions are still in effect. H.R. 5894 would remove these arbitrary limitations, and bring the women officers under the general retirement and promotion statutes that apply to male officers.

The bill will affect approximately 12,362 women officers. This includes 10,061 nurses and medical specialists, and 2,301 women in the WAC's, WAVES, WAF's, and women marines. The experience that we have had with this fine body of women in the service has proven, over the past 20 years, that they have a right to expect equitable promotion consideration.

Let me cite some of the important inequities that will be overcome by the enactment of this legislation. In the women's line components of each service only one position is permitted by law to the rank of colonel, or Navy captain, and then only for the period while the individual is serving as director of the women's corps concerned—that is the Women's Army Corps, the WAC's, women in the Navy, WAVES, women in the Air Force, WAF's, and women marines. A similar restriction applies to the grades of lieutenant colonel and commander.

The allowances permitted by law for nurse and medical specialist corps officers are somewhat larger, but these too are also highly restricted. In the Army Nurse Corps, for example, a total of five nurses can occupy the permanent rank of colonel and 107 can occupy the permanent rank of lieutenant colonel. These quotas were established on the basis of an Army force structure of 500,000. The same personnel limitations apply to the Air Force.

In the Navy Nurse Corps only one-fifth of 1 percent of the corps officer strength may be in the rank of captain. This contrasts with 5.3 percent authorized by law for this grade of male line officers. Due to such limitations, many women officers, regardless of their qualifications, length of service, and responsibilities may not reach a rank commensurate with their responsibilities, nor commensurate with the promotional opportunities available to male officers.

The Navy WAVE component has a particularly serious problem today due to statutory grade limitations. If these limitations are not removed, promotions to the rank of commander in the WAVES over the next 4 or 5 years will have to be suspended, and the average attrition among women line lieutenants will average 65 percent compared to a maximum desirable ratio of 20 percent.

There are many differences in the mandatory retirement and separations for women officers in the different services. Generally, however, they require the women to leave the service earlier than male officers.

While the purpose of this legislation is to give women officers equality of promotional opportunity consistent with the needs of the service, there is no indication that the Department of Defense will attempt to remove restrictions on the kind of military duties that women are

expected to perform. The Committee on Armed Services is aware that there cannot be complete equality between men and women in the matter of military careers. The demands of combat, sea duty and other types of assignments directly related to combat are not placed upon women in our society.

This legislation is not a promotion bill. It does not guarantee anyone a promotion. However, it does provide a woman officer filling an important billet the opportunity to advance to the rank appropriate to the billet she is holding. In short, it prevents discrimination because of sex. At the same time, the bill is not designed to speed up the promotion of women, and the committee has repeatedly made it clear that the bill will not be used for inflation of grades customarily held by women officers. The Defense Department has assured us that where the job, the size of the staff, and the responsibilities do not change, that it will not expect the grade of the officer to change as a result of the passage of this bill.

I should like to point out, that this bill does make it possible for a woman to rise to general or flag officer rank, but the Department of Defense assures us again that there are no special opportunities in view, and they do not predict that there ever may be such an opportunity for a woman. The question of whether a woman officer may achieve general or flag rank will depend entirely on her individual qualifications, and on the availability of a specific position for which she would be best qualified. The bill provides that in the event of such a promotion, the woman holding the rank of general or admiral would hold it only while serving in that specific position.

As a result of careful study, the armed services are expanding the women's line components by over 9,500 personnel in the near future. This will include approximately 800 more women officers. There is no question that there will be growing opportunities for women in a variety of staff and support positions, in such fields as logistics, intelligence, data processing, legal, financial management, personnel management, and, of course, the important nursing and medical fields. Thus it becomes increasingly important that we have fair and equitable career patterns for this essential part of our Armed Forces.

In view of the commendable service rendered by women in the Armed Forces, the many restrictions and limitations under which they have suffered for this period of time and the growing opportunities in staff and support positions for women in uniform, I urge the adoption of H.R. 5894.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 676), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would amend titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to remove the provisions

visions that limit the career opportunities available to women officers so that on the basis of merit they may have the same promotion and career tenure opportunities as male officers in similar circumstances.

BACKGROUND

The several laws that have established the female components of the Armed Forces contain special provisions that (a) limit the grades which women officers can attain; (b) place numerical or percentage limitations on the number of women officers that can serve in the various pay grades; or (c) provide separate standards for the retirement and separation of women officers, including mandatory retirement for women at lower ages than those generally applicable to male officers. For example, in the women's components other than those for nurses and medical specialists, the highest permanent grade to which a woman can be promoted is lieutenant colonel or commander. Each service has one colonel (captain in the Navy) who holds that grade only while serving as the head of the women's component. When she completes that tour, she reverts to her permanent grade. The women nurses and medical specialists have somewhat larger allowances but the provisions applicable to them are also more restrictive than comparable provisions for male officers. In the Army Nurse Corps, for instance, a total of five nurses may occupy the permanent grade of colonel, and only 107 may have the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel.

The Wacs and Wafs are limited to 10 percent of their Regular officer strength in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel. The Waves and women marines are allowed 30 percent of their Regular officer strength in the combined commander-lieutenant commander or lieutenant colonel-major grades, with a limit of 10 percent in the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel.

On retirement and separation provisions, the laws applicable to women generally require that they leave the service earlier than a male officer but in some cases they permit women to remain on active duty for longer periods, than male officers. Under current circumstances, there is no logical basis for these differences.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

The bill makes many changes to titles 10, 32, and 37 of the United States Code to remove the arbitrary limitations and restrictions mentioned above. After enactment, the bill would allow Wacs, Waves, Wafs, and women marines to hold permanent grades up through the rank of colonel (captain in the Navy). It would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to prescribe the grade distribution for the women components so that the promotion and career opportunities for women officers could be governed by generally the same standards that apply to male officers.

For the first time there would be authority to appoint women as flag or general officers.

The bill also would apply the same attrition and elimination provisions to women officers as those that apply to men. The only exception would be a special authority for the selective continuation of nurses.

STATISTICS

The table that follows shows the distribution of women officers on active duty in the Armed Forces.

Service	Line components	Medical components	Total
Army.....	851	3,881	4,732
Navy.....	500	2,300	2,800
Marine Corps....	188	—	188
Air Force.....	762	3,880	4,642
Total....	2,301	10,061	12,362

SELECTIVE CONTINUATION OF NURSES

Since the bill subjects women officers to the same retirement provisions that apply to male officers, it could result in the loss of nurses earlier than is true under present law. Because of the urgent need for nurses as a result of our deployment in Vietnam, it is undesirable to require an accelerated separation of military nurses now. Consequently, the bill contains selective retention authority for boards of officers to choose nurses who would otherwise be retired or separated for continuation on active duty for a period of 5 years. The continuation authority would end on July 1, 1967, but deferments of separations made before that date could extend to July 1, 1967.

ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICE IN NATIONAL GUARD

Under existing law women may be appointed as reserves with a view to serving in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard only if they are nurses or medical specialists. The bill repeals this limitation and permits the Federal recognition of female commissioned officers generally.

NOT A PROMOTION BILL

The bill is not a special promotion authority in itself. It does not guarantee any person a promotion.

The committee was assured that the bill is not designed to create special promotional opportunities for women officers and that there are no definite plans to establish general or flag rank positions for women. By removing discriminatory and indiscriminate distinctions that now exist, the bill will permit normal operation of the personnel system to result in promotions on the basis of merit and performance. Whether a woman officer may achieve general or flag rank will depend on her personal qualifications and on the availability of a specific position requiring an officer of such rank for which she would be best qualified.

There have been some promotion and retirement inequities in the past that this bill should help to eliminate.

COST

It is impractical to estimate the cost of this legislation.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EXPLORATIONS OF FATHER JACQUES MARQUETTE

The bill (H.R. 1499) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 678), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission established by Public Law 89-187 up to 200,000 national medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America. The medals are to be furnished without cost to the United States. The design of the medal, including

emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; the Secretary is authorized to determine the size or sizes and the composition of the medals in consultation with the Commission.

The medals are to be furnished in quantities of not less than 2,000. No medals may be made under the authorization of this legislation after December 31, 1973. The Commission is required to furnish security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAN DIEGO

The bill (H.R. 13212) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 679), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the San Diego Two-Hundredth Anniversary, Inc., a not-for-profit organization created for the purpose of celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the San Diego community, not more than 500,000 national medals in commemoration of the anniversary. The medals are to be produced and furnished at no cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under the authority of this legislation after December 31, 1969.

The design, sizes, and composition of the medals are to be determined by the organization sponsoring the celebration, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals may be ordered in quantities of not less than 2,000, and no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of each order, including labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The bill (H.R. 10160) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 680), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to manufacture up to 1 million national medals commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding in 1919 of the

American Legion. The medals are to be produced at no cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under the authority of this legislation after December 31, 1969. The design of the medals, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the American Legion subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. They may be of such size or sizes and of such composition as the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine, in consultation with the American Legion. They may be furnished in quantities of not less than 2,000 upon security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of all costs, including the estimated cost of labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

THE AMERICAN LEGION SERVES THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

The American Legion, the largest organization of veterans of our armed services, was founded in Paris, France, March 15-17, 1919. It has grown to a membership of 2,600,000 in 16,500 posts in this country and abroad.

Born in the crucible of war but dedicated to peace, the American Legion has been an integral part of the fabric of American life throughout most of the 20th century. From the beginning its objectives have included the strengthening of our way of life, maintenance of the national security, care for the children of America, and aid to those who have fallen in battle and to their widows and orphans.

The American Legion helped to conceive and pilot through Congress the broad structure of compensation, pension, and medical programs which now guard the safety, security, and health of the wounded and the disabled. The crowning achievement of this effort was the GI bill for veterans of World War II. This milestone in the history of veterans affairs was sponsored by the Legion and approved by the Congress so that the men and women of World War II would not return to a nation of unprepared to receive them as it was to receive the victors of World War I. Extension of this farsighted program to Korean veterans and later to veterans of Vietnam was supported by the Legion.

Through its rehabilitation program the Legion stands watch over the rights and fair treatment of all veterans and their dependents—with particular concern for the service-connected disabled and for the families of those who gave their lives.

Early in the life of the organization it recognized that the threat to the security of our country had not ended with World War I. Through the years it has worked diligently to alert the American people to the fact that communism poses a serious threat to the safety of the Nation.

The Legion recommended against the neglect which the armed services experienced in the years between the two World Wars. Consistently it urged that all branches of the military services be modernized. In the years since the end of World War II it has continued to urge a strong defense and to support the efforts of the armed services to maintain a state of readiness which would both deter aggressors and enable America to defend itself if attacked.

While concerned with matters affecting the welfare of the country in difficult times, the Legion has never forgotten that the future of the Nation depends upon its young citizens. Its child welfare program for nearly 50 years has demonstrated concern for America's children. With thousands of volunteer workers in the Legion and in its auxiliary—and with the broad principles developed in the field of child care—it is recognized as one of the leading nonprofessional private organizations in this area. Through the years the organization has spent hundreds of millions of dollars in direct assist-

ance to children, and in addition has secured passage of enlightened legislation at both State and National levels for the benefit of all of the children of America. The Legion's Boys State and Boys Nation programs teach better citizenship to thousands of boys each year. The organization seeks to build character and desirable habits in young Americans through its sponsorship of over 4,000 Boy Scout units across the Nation and a quarter of a million American youth learn the rules of the game of life while playing American Legion baseball each year.

As plans go forward to celebrate its 50th anniversary the American Legion continues as a strong, vigilant, and responsible organization of patriotic Americans dedicated to maintenance of law and order and service to the community, State, and Nation, an organization which has contributed immeasurably to the advance of freedom.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

The bill (H.R. 10105) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 681), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi not more than 100,000 national medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary on December 10, 1867, of the admission of Mississippi to the Union. The medals are to be furnished, in quantities of not less than 2,000, without cost to the United States. No medals may be manufactured under authority of this legislation after December 31, 1968.

The design of the medals, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions, is to be determined by the Agricultural and Industrial Board of the State of Mississippi, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals will be of such size or sizes and of such composition as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the board. Security must be furnished satisfactory to the Director of the Mint to indemnify the United States for full payment of the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 2275) for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Vallejo Samala was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE SQUAXIN ISLAND TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8580) to convey certain land to the Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

with an amendment on page 2, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to declare that certain lands are held in trust for the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 683), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8580 is to hold in trust for the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to 1.84 acres of land lying within the Squaxin Island Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington.

NEED

The Treaty of Medicine Creek of December 26, 1854 (10 Stat. 1132), set apart Squaxin Island and other areas for the "use and occupation" of several Indian tribes and bands, including the Squaxin Indian Tribe of Indians. In 1884, the entire upland area was allotted to 24 Indians as heads of families, pursuant to article 6 of the 1854 treaty. Thereafter, in 1913, the heirs of an original allottee conveyed the land to which H.R. 8580 refers by warranty deed to the United States for the purpose of establishing a day school.

The property has never been used for school purposes and because of the lack of utilities and public transportation, Indian families with children have moved off the reservation. Since the 1920's a few Indian families have lived permanently on the reservation and several have lived there part time. Only two to three cabins remain on the reservation and are used by Indian families for summer recreational purposes. There are no Indians permanently residing on the reservation at this time. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has no future use or need for this property.

Squaxin Island is within the Puget Sound area of the State of Washington, approximately 10 miles north of the city of Olympia. Access to the island is by private boat only and the subject property is located on the east side of the island and fronts waters known as Peals Passage.

The Squaxin Island Tribe of Indians owns no tribal lands as such, although it does own 8 miles of tidelands surrounding Squaxin Island. The tribe has a strong desire to own the 1.84 acres and considers ownership of this land essential to the preservation of its identity. Since 1960, there has been increased interest in the island as a potential for recreational homesite development. Several of the Indian allotments have been sold to outside interests.

The Squaxin Tribe, in addition, to regarding ownership of this property as essential to preserving its tribal identity, has developed plans to use the site as a community center for tribal meetings, tribal ceremonies and picnics, as well as establishing a museum for

Indian artifacts and other recreational and cultural purposes. The surrounding tribal tidelands support excellent beds of clams and oysters. The tribe plans to establish an "Oyster Opening House" and provide seasonal employment to tribal members and a market for Indian oyster and clam growers.

The present appraised value of the land is \$5,000. The only improvement on the property has a present estimated value of \$1,125. There is no known oil, gas, or other mineral potential in the 1.84 acres declared to be held in trust by the United States for the Squaxin Tribe of Indians, as provided in this legislation.

COST

No expenditure of Federal funds is required under the provisions of H.R. 8580.

AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted two amendments, the first of which adds a new section 2 to the bill providing that the Indian Claims Commission shall determine in connection with any claim the Squaxin Island Tribe has pending the extent to which the value of any award made by H.R. 8580 shall or shall not be set off against any award made to the tribe.

The second amendment changes the title of the bill to properly describe the donation of the lands involved to the tribe in a trust status.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar for today.

Is there further morning business?

SENATOR RIBICOFF SPEAKS ON THE URBAN CRISIS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, few Members of Congress have been more concerned about, or become more familiar with, the problems of urban life in the United States than the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. After a distinguished career as a lawyer, member of the Connecticut General Assembly, Hartford city judge, U.S. Representative, and Governor of his State, Senator RIBICOFF served as the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Kennedy administration. In the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee, he has held extensive hearings for more than a year exploring many aspects of the plight now confronting most of our metropolitan centers.

Senator RIBICOFF's investigation has been instrumental in uncovering data and gathering testimony which will be extremely significant in any program designed to alleviate the multifold and complex problems of our cities. In particular, he has focused national attention on the urban slum and so-called ghetto areas where large numbers of unemployed, poverty-stricken, limited-opportunity people, often members of minority groups, are concentrated.

On October 22, Senator RIBICOFF delivered a major address at Butler University in Indianapolis, Ind., at a conference which had for its theme "The City and the Future." After reviewing some of the basic social, economic and cultural factors which have contributed to the crisis situation in metropolitan affairs and which have sometimes resulted in violence, Senator RIBICOFF

called for a realistic but positive approach. Pointing out that we do not fully understand the effect which ghetto living has on its inhabitants, especially the young, he reminded us that this is truly a national responsibility:

We can no longer fall back on our ignorance of urban problems. To be sure, we are unfamiliar with a host of issues and situations that city building must deal with. But our age of innocence is over. The richest country in the world must become more than a schoolboy in the city gathering facts for a term paper.

Senator RIBICOFF suggested six elements which he believes to be essential in any program looking toward the ending of present day slums and building the city of tomorrow. In view of the timeliness and importance of his remarks and in order that other Members of Congress may read this thoughtful and provocative treatment of a primary national problem, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Contrary to popular myth, Americans have done pretty well in the city.

We have been there for several decades, and found a wide range of social, economic and political choice in cities of varying size, location and opportunity. And now that science and technology have given us the chance to build the kind of urban environment we claim we want, the journey to the 21st Century holds as much promise as any trip to the moon. And more of us will be on board.

But both the past and the future can be misleading.

Because the burning issue in America today is not how well the majority has done as an urban nation or what kind of life styles we will create by the year 2000. The issue is how—and whether—we unite a divided nation and bring into the American mainstream all those who feel separated from this country for reasons of technology, economic status, and race.

Sixteen million poor live in our metropolitan areas—10 million in our central cities. Another 26 million live in the shadowland of deprivation—with incomes above the minimum poverty level, but below what most authorities define as "adequate" means.

Among the Negro, this poverty is the most prevalent and the most severe. Three of every five persons living in poverty in our large cities are Negro. To a large degree, Negro Americans are an underdeveloped nation living in the heart of America.

This did not happen overnight. It took a century to develop—a century of neglect. Nor was it planned, although the results are as systematic and devastating as if it had been planned—every bit of it—down to the last detail.

If anyone doubts this, let him look at the statistics. For perhaps fact will succeed where rhetoric has failed.

The Negro migration to the city was the largest and fastest movement of a single group of people in all our history.

When the Negro began his hopeful exodus to the North and to the city in 1910, a total of 73 per cent of all Negroes in America lived on farms and in areas with a population of less than 2,500.

By 1960, these figures had been completely reversed, and 73 per cent of all Negroes were living in urban areas, as defined by the Census Bureau. Within a period of 50 years—

less than one lifetime—the Negro was transformed from a rural to an urban resident.

The concentration of Negroes in the central cities was just as dramatic. By 1960, half of all non-whites in America were living in central city ghettos.

The stage had been set. The Negro had escaped from the rural segregation of the South to what he believed was the open society of the North. He had seen, as Ralph Ellison said in testimony before our Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, "the wonderful possibilities offered by the city to define one's individuality, to amplify one's talent, to find a place for oneself in this social situation."

But as soon as the Negro moved in, the whites moved out. They were abandoning the central cities for the suburbs. That alone was not disastrous. But they were taking the jobs and factories with them.

In the low-income neighborhood of an earlier generation, a man could walk to work. But between 1960 and 1965, three-fifths of all new industrial plants were going up outside the central cities. In some cities, the percentage of new plants being built away from the areas of highest unemployment was 85 per cent.

Finding a job—let alone getting to it—became a huge burden. Harry Dolan, a writer from Watts told the Subcommittee that his play, "The Sand Clock Day," came from such an experience.

Dolan said:

"It is the thinking of just one day spent looking for a job. . . . Of taking \$2.80 just to go to the place, of taking two and a half hours to reach it, two and a half hours back. That is \$10 or \$12 a week. Sometimes it is even the house money that you are using to go look for a job."

There were jobs in the city all right. But they were largely skilled office and managerial tasks for which the low-income Negro often lacked the education and training.

Severe unemployment began to set in.

Unemployment rates in central cities jumped to twice and three times the national rate. In some places, the unemployment rate was the highest since the Depression of the 1930's.

Not even a steady job could guarantee a man a decent standard of living. A Labor Department survey found that one-third of the residents in 10 big city slums were unable to earn a living. They were either unemployed, were paid poor wages, or could find only part-time work. And those who were employed frequently worked at dead-end jobs that gave them little or no training for advancement.

The people kept trying—but usually without success. A Job Fair in Oakland, California, attracted 15,000 people and resulted in placement for only 250. In Philadelphia, a waiting list of 6,000 existed for one training program alone.

Meanwhile, a new generation was growing up. The post-war baby boom affected the city just as much as the suburb, with the result that in the typical urban slum, nearly half the population now was under 18. But they were suffering from even greater unemployment than their parents.

Whereas Negro adults had an unemployment rate twice that of white adults, unemployment among Negro teen-agers in certain areas was almost four times as great as that of white teen-agers.

Young Negroes applying for jobs often were told they were too young or too bright.

Johnnie Scott, another resident of Watts, told our Subcommittee he took an intelligence test for a large company. The highest score was 200. A score of 100 was an "A". Johnnie Scott scored 150. He told us: "They patted me on the back and said, 'You are a whiz kid. Come back when you are 18.' " He was 17 at the time. He had just graduated from high school.

Gradually, the people were being separated from the jobs—both physically and psychologically. And the greatest damage was in—and to—the mind, as the school dropout and achievement rates proved.

The average Negro was graduating from high school with less than a ninth grade education. Put another way, 360,000 young Negroes were entering the labor force each year with an education that did not even qualify them for a blue collar job.

High school or vocational graduates could not spell "brick" or "carpenter". They could not add inches or feet. A Building and Construction Trades Committee in New York City reported that Negroes were "the products of a social system that pushed them through the earlier grades of school without insuring that they had the basic tools necessary for a minimal academic education."

It was not that the youngsters lacked ability. The Bancker School District in St. Louis and the Demonstration School Project in New York proved that even in segregated schools, Negroes could do good work. But it often was expensive—\$200 per pupil above the normal outlay in New York—at a time when big cities—having lost their tax revenues as well as their white residents—already were spending \$135 less per pupil than the suburbs. And in the Bancker case, where no extra funds were spent, success demanded a commitment of people and time that few were prepared to make.

The situation worsened. Not only was a segregated education an inferior education, but segregation was on the rise.

In Washington, D.C., 90 per cent of the students were Negro. In New York City, Negroes and Puerto Ricans comprised the majority of the school population. In Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and Cleveland, the situation was the same. Boston, a city with only a 15 per cent Negro population, had an elementary school population that was 30 per cent Negro.

The circle was complete. In his march from the farm to the city, the Negro had followed a path that led to bad housing, unemployment, poor education, and finally to a new and more frustrating form of segregation.

But if these facts existed for many years, why did they suddenly explode in 1964 and every summer since in cities both large and small? Clearly, there was no single answer. And just as clearly, the explosions were not as sudden as we might like to believe. An army of psychiatrists might never explain the riots and the conditions leading to them to our satisfaction. But one didn't have to be a psychiatrist to notice some dramatic changes among both whites and Negroes.

Even without a racial crisis, the post World War II years would have been difficult. For the last 22 years, change has been the largest single factor in our lives—change in our working habits, our living patterns, our institutions of business and government, and our role as a nation.

Much of this was due to new knowledge and technology. But the price of a mass society in which most people had a greater opportunity to participate in more events and situations frequently was fear, anxiety, loneliness and insecurity.

Men warned about technology and automation felt they were losing control over their own lives—even if they were not. Large organizations and bureaucracies now a fact of life, were feared automatically on the theory that these impersonal institutions would snuff out the human spirit.

The basic posture of the United States as a world power also was shifting and affecting our individual lives and collective identity.

In short, a whole social order was changing. We sought a familiar spot in which to anchor our feelings, but could not find one—often because we did not even know what our feelings were. America succeeded to a

crisis mentality. Unable to comprehend either the change or its speed, many sought refuge in fear and hysteria, closing their minds to all thoughts save simple answers that would provide an easy way out of a troubled world.

And then, the man at the bottom began to push. World War II made the Negro a mobile person, and millions came to the city where television, their own eyes, and their own experiences taught them new lessons. No longer would they sit silently at the bottom while the rest of society changed. They wanted their share of the American dream.

Mrs. Rosa Parks decided she was tired of sitting at the back of the bus, and in 1955 the civil rights movement began in Montgomery, Alabama. The great unresolved crisis of America would now be played out. But it would take another decade before the Northern cities became fully aware of this fact.

For years, Americans had been able to live quite apart from the plight of the Negro. But now the Negro made his move at exactly that time when most Americans felt they had found some security in the modern world.

The movement, still fundamentally non-violent, headed North, drawing strength and courage from sit-ins and jailings.

Soon the civil rights movement itself, which had centered around court-related matters such as voting and public accommodations, began to change. Although it reached its peak with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, it now was clear that these actions were designed for the middle-class Negro and that they had little relevance to the concentrated poverty of the Northern ghetto. There the issues were more basic: unemployment, bad housing, poor schools, high crime rates, poor law enforcement.

Reaction was swift, and promises made in high places were believed by people far down the line. But when these promises were not met, when the only results seemed to be urban renewal and public housing programs that moved Negroes from one slum to another or a welfare system that perpetuated dependency, the Negro grew impatient.

Now the catalyst was added—the generation gap. The young Negroes of America were an urban generation. They were judging their lives not against the rural past of their parents but against the opportunities they saw in the city—and against the equality of those opportunities. It was true that life was improving in the sense that the Negro of the 1960's was better off than the Negro of 1945. But life was not improving fast enough. The Negro was falling further behind the white man—and that was the comparison that counted. The important doors were closed. And closed doors in an open society—whether due to outright discrimination or an inability to use opportunity—lead to a deep cynicism, anger, and rage.

The cynicism began very early in life.

Dr. Robert Coles, a child psychiatrist involved in the Operation Exodus school busing experiment in Boston, said children between the ages of six and ten told him he was a fool for thinking better schools or better education would lead to anything.

And the cynicism grew. Dr. Coles told the Subcommittee:

"The problem that afflicts both these children and their teachers is that the teachers cannot give them jobs when they get to be about 15 or 16 . . . (The teachers) are being called hypocrites. (The students ask) where does it pay off? It hasn't paid off. The children—who are no longer children—are now asking: what kind of a naive, dumb idiot are you if you don't realize this?"

And finally, a young man like Johnnie Scott sums up the personal damage when he says:

"The ghetto is not the houses. It is the people. It is in the mind. The ghetto has a habit of reaching your life just when you think you've climbed to the top of the moun-

tain and, in one fell swoop, bringing you crashing to the bottom to be buried beneath the rocks. (In the slums), evil is taken for granted. . . . One does not ever really escape from a ghetto. One only hopes that time will wear off the sharper, the cutting edges."

That was how the young Negro who did not riot felt. What about those who did?

So deep and so strong was the split between the generations that A. Philip Randolph, one of the senior statesmen of the American Negro community, told the Subcommittee:

"I have walked up and down the streets of Harlem for over 60 years, and I don't remember the time when I have met young men to whom I was unable to talk. (Now) the young teen-agers and Negroes who are in poverty don't trust the Negro leadership. They believe that they represent the will of the so-called white power structure. . . . I am alarmed about the change in the psychology of Negro youth, because here you have the foundation of the future generation. . . . They believe society is against them. They believe that the promise of a job is merely a hoax."

And Bayard Rustin told of listening to a group of young Negroes in Los Angeles talking about their manifesto. When he asked to see it, one youth held up a book of matches, lit one and said:

"That is our manifesto: Burn, baby, burn."

To call this a crisis of belief seems an enormous understatement. But that is what it is. For one reason or another, often for many at the same time, young Negroes have lost their faith in the promise of America. Unable to accomplish their goals in acceptable ways, some have resorted to violence. Often, the violence has accomplished what reasoned approaches and orderly protest could not—from sprinklers on fire hydrants to more job opportunities.

And this is tragic in itself. For it says more about us—those who do not live in the ghetto—then it does about those who do. It tells us that in spite of all the information, description and statistics we have heard and seen the past several years, we still do not understand what the ghetto does to people—to individual human beings. We do not understand the kind of life ghetto children are born into or what happens to a person who tries to lift himself out of the ghetto.

Our responsibility is clear. As a nation, we have been as unsystematic about ending the social and economic conditions of the ghetto as the ghetto has been systematic in its denial of opportunity.

We can no longer fall back on our ignorance of urban problems. To be sure, we are unfamiliar with a host of issues and situations that city building must deal with. But our age of innocence is over. The richest country in the world must become more than a schoolboy in the city gathering facts for a term paper.

The analogy may seem harsh. Yet in view of the unsolved problems that threaten to blow the lid off our cities and our response to them, it seems accurate. For our national effort seems pitifully out of scale with the enormity of the crisis.

Why is this so? I can think of many reasons, but they all come down to one: that we are unwilling to act upon the information we have.

We prefer to devise elaborate theories of urban behavior and develop techniques of systems analysis as if the articulation of these plans were equal to solving the problem.

The word has become tantamount to the deed. We seek out new technology in the hope that it will provide a cost-free solution. We offer visions of the future to people who are trapped in the present. We engage in national debates about what causes riots and what they represent in societal terms

when we have mountains of evidence about severe unemployment in our central cities, the low quality of the public schools, the number of substandard housing units and the high crime rates.

It is time we changed—and began to put into practice what all of us are willing to do in theory: to develop and implement on a systematic basis a comprehensive and long-range strategy for building our cities and creating within them full security, full opportunity, full choice, and full freedom—so that, when poverty and injustice occur, as they inevitably shall, it will truly be a matter of accident and not strike the same families generation after generation.

And the place to start is just as clear as our responsibility. We start with jobs and make the commitment to full employment that we debated about in 1946 but never made. A growing society can provide employment for all if that society is willing. And many jobs can be tied to the improvements that we must make in our homes and neighborhoods.

I do not have the whole answer. Nor does anyone else. But I do believe that any program of ending the slums and building the city of tomorrow must include six basic elements:

First, Guaranteed job opportunities for all;

Second, Providing a decent home in a decent environment that includes personal security and public safety;

Third, Offering the maximum encouragement to private investment in rebuilding our cities and the lives of our people;

Fourth, Involving the individual in his own destiny and emphasizing neighborhood development;

Fifth, Reorganizing our Federal government so that the new ideas of today will not wither on the bureaucratic vines of yesterday; and

Sixth, Developing an educational system that will equip all children with the skills and resources necessary for an urban society.

I cannot promise—nor should anyone else—that we can guarantee an end to violence by mounting a full-scale assault on the problems of poverty and discrimination as they exist in our cities. Generations of injustice cannot be corrected overnight, nor can long suffering be forgotten quickly. But on the other hand, failure to take major and sweeping actions to relieve legitimate tensions and grievances that press so heavily on our central city residents will further widen the gulf that already threatens to divide our nation.

The question Lewis Mumford posed for urban society as a whole applies to America in particular. And that is whether mankind "shall devote himself to the development of his own deepest humanity, or whether he shall surrender himself to the now almost automatic forces he has set in motion."

The choice is that simple—and that crucial.

AMERICAN LEGION COMMANDER GALBRAITH REPORTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the first undertakings of the newly elected national commander of the American Legion, Mr. William Galbraith, was a trip to Southeast Asia to visit our commanders and our troops in South Vietnam. As the leader of an association of former citizen-soldiers, it was fitting that he see at firsthand the situation of our present citizen-soldiers.

On October 18, Commander Galbraith, who, I am proud to note, is a fellow Nebraskan, delivered his report on Viet-

nam to the national executive committee of the American Legion, at Indianapolis. This report provides us with valuable and fresh insight into the situation in Vietnam. His description of the American fighting man is particularly welcome after the recent week of demonstrations and draft card burnings.

No American favors war. This point is sometimes obscured by the demonstrations and debate. Commander Galbraith put it well when he explained:

What I have told you of the performance of the American fighting man in Vietnam should not in any way be construed as a glorification or a defense of warfare, for The American Legion, comprised of men and women who have known war, deprecates this method of settling differences between men and nations probably more than any other organization in the world.

"Freedom Is Not Free" has been adopted as the American Legion theme for this year. The truth of this statement is being proven by the blood and sweat of America's fighting men. In concert with the South Vietnamese and our other allies, they are paying the price of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commander Galbraith's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON VIETNAM

(By William E. Galbraith, national commander, the American Legion, before the National Executive Committee, at Indianapolis, Ind., October 18, 1967)

Distinguished guests and members of the National Executive Committee, I felt a deep obligation to report to you personally tonight on the observations of my recent trip to Vietnam for I would not have been there if not as your representatives.

Recognizing my first responsibility to my country and to you, as leaders of The American Legion, I am happy that the timing of events has permitted me to make my initial report to this distinguished gathering.

As most of you know, I have been a farmer and businessman most of my life, and I feel it would be in order for me to relate some of these experiences, not only as National Commander of The American Legion, but in terms of those things which I know best.

This is a complicated war, a new and different type of military operation from anything we have previously experienced in all of our history. This fact alone, I suspect, could well account for a great deal of the unrest among our own people today for we are not seeing the decisive battle results that have marked other periods of conflict. Lack of understanding may provide a reason, but a very poor excuse, for the dissension at home which is doing a genuine disservice to our fighting men.

Further complicating this situation is the fact that it is not a military operation alone, but involves the Revolutionary Development program formerly known as the civic action program which is aimed at establishing stability of both the government and economy of an emerging nation, a nation which has lived under the domination of three governments in the past 20 years—China, France, and the attempted establishment of a free and independent South Vietnam, which could and would have succeeded on its own had it not been for a communist aggression from the north.

After living for so long under foreign domination, and living with terrorism, violence and subversion in the few short years

in which the South Vietnamese have endeavored to establish self-government, the lack of stability in this new nation today is readily understandable.

It is important too, to understand why the Chinese Communists are so intent on carrying on this war and to keep the North Vietnamese away from the conference table.

Here is where my background as a farmer stood me in good stead. It is obvious that Red China and communist North Vietnam want to control the rich farmlands of the Mekong Delta in the south. This area, if modern agricultural methods and techniques could be applied, is capable of providing food for 60 per cent of the population of Asia. The Chinese communists and communist regime of North Vietnam know this, and they look to this rich agricultural prize as a source of food for the teeming masses of Asia.

The stakes are tremendously high in this battle for food, for the reports emanating from Red China indicate a high degree of instability for the communist government on mainland China, and an adequate food supply is vital to a re-establishment of stability for that government.

Our own involvement in South Vietnam is based on solemn commitments and has objectives which are readily understandable to all who want to understand them. First, we are there to insure the security and territorial integrity of a nation which has not been permitted to stand on its own. That is our military commitment purely and simply. We do not seek territorial gains. We do not seek military or political domination or control.

The other part of our commitment, and no less important, is to help bring stability to both the government and to the economy of South Vietnam. To do this, we are helping with the building of roads so vital to transportation and communication. We are providing the tools and the know how to help develop the tremendous agricultural potential of the country, and effective system of public works is badly needed, for here are a people surrounded by water and virtually none of it is drinkable, railroads need to be built, and the educational facilities are in need of expansion and upgrading.

I can speak with some degree of authority on that latter point also, for I did spend 10 years of my life as a school teacher.

Now it is most difficult to accomplish these things under perfectly normal conditions, so you can well imagine how the problems of the South Vietnamese are magnified in attempting to do these things while a shooting war is in progress all about them. Progress, understandably, is slow, but I assure you that progress is being made both militarily, and from the civic action standpoint.

Now what did we actually see in Vietnam? We saw the modern world's foremost example of the theme I have selected for my term of office as National Commander of The American Legion: "Freedom Is Not Free."

We saw young Americans and young Vietnamese fighting shoulder to shoulder, under intolerable combat conditions, in a concerted effort to insure the blessings of freedom for a new nation whose people want to be free.

Saigon was merely a point of departure for us, although there we received the benefit of significant, in depth, briefings on the overall military situation from General Westmoreland, the commander of the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. From there, we went to the scenes of action, and I must phrase it that way because in this war there is no front. Here is the evidence of the new type of war, guerrilla warfare, which knows no front, which recognizes no rules or conventions, and which may erupt violently at any point and with no warning.

Probably the closest thing to a so-called "front" that exists in Vietnam today is that area just below the misnamed demilitarized zone which divides the two Vietnams. This

is a misnomer, for from within it and from just to the north of it, the communists have levelled devastating artillery barrages into some of our Marine units, inflicting severe casualties over the past several weeks.

We can testify that it is a combat area for one of the helicopters in which our party was flying was hit by enemy ground fire. The defenses which our fighting men are holding just to the south of the DMZ can accurately be described as the most forward, the most exposed, and the most desolate real estate in all of South Vietnam.

What has this shelling of our positions accomplished? For the communists, nothing! For Americans, it has built a determination to hold those positions which are, in effect, the observation posts overlooking the traditional infiltration routes across the DMZ from North to South Vietnam. These men are holding as tenaciously as any American fighting men have ever held any position in the history of American arms.

Their performance, their dogged determination, their will to win, would stir the soul and quicken the pulse of any American patriot who ever wore the uniform of his country in time of combat, and of any other citizen of this great land with a knowledge of and a respect for the incomparable heritage of freedom that is ours.

We were privileged to go aboard the U.S.S. Constellation, an American aircraft carrier stationed in the Gulf of Tonkin, and from which young American pilots fly round-the-clock sorties against enemy military targets. The courage and the fighting spirit of America's modern day defenders of freedom is in keeping with the finest traditions of American fighting men from the days of the war for independence, through the great wars of the twentieth century, and every other conflict in which this nation has engaged in nearly two centuries of history.

I should tell you also, that we visited American military and diplomatic officials all along the western Pacific defense perimeter from Japan to Taiwan to Hong Kong and Manila, and it was here that we found what we considered to be proof positive that there is a great deal more at stake with the American presence in South Vietnam than the security and independence of South Vietnam itself.

The people of these areas look to a strong, firm and determined American presence in Southeast Asia as the means to their own salvation against further communist encroachment spawned by the communist government on mainland Red China.

What I have told you of the performance of the American fighting man in Vietnam should not in any way be construed as a glorification or a defense of warfare, for The American Legion, comprised of men and women who have known war, deprecates this method of settling differences between men and nations probably more than any other organization in the world.

We do, however, believe that the cause to which we are now committed in South Vietnam is correct, proper and just, that it is in our own vital national interest, and that we must get on with the business winning this conflict whether it be on the battlefield or around the conference table. Like all other concerned people, we would prefer that the task might be accomplished through good faith negotiating, but since we seem to have nobody with whom to negotiate we must pursue the only other course available to us.

We of the Legion are deeply concerned about the great debate being carried on here at home regarding the conduct of the war and the validity and the wisdom of the commitment of United States forces to that war. We are concerned that those who oppose this commitment have failed to propose a reasonable alternative to the course we are now pursuing. We believe that if The American Legion is to fulfill a useful purpose on

the American scene, if we are to serve the cause of those men who bear our flag into battle in Vietnam, we must participate in this debate with all of the strength and ability at our command.

We came away from Vietnam with some very definite conclusions, paramount among which is the belief that we are winning this war. It is not a dramatic victory of the type which we have experienced in other conflicts. It is a slow and steady process of attrition in which American and allied forces have the upper hand. We have the ability and the capability to do the job.

Second, we have a firm conviction, despite the harangues of the new left and of certain congressional critics, that this is not a civil war among the people of Vietnam but is very definitely a war of aggression being waged by communist North Vietnam—with massive support from the Soviet bloc and Red China—against the people of South Vietnam. The end of that war will come when that aggression ends.

Third, there must be no cessation of the bombing of the north, nor can there be any truce in the fighting unless we first receive the assurances from the other side that there will be meaningful negotiations, in good faith, designed to bring these hostilities to a prompt and reasonable conclusion.

While I have enumerated this as a third conclusion, it is really the most important of all. Everyone we talked with on this trip, from general and admirals to pilots and plain G.I.s, expressed the opinion that our bombing of strategic targets in North Vietnam must not be discontinued short of the conference table and a genuine cease fire on both sides.

We realize that this does not coincide with the theories of some of our congressional critics, arm-chair generals, pacifists and others here at home.

Personally, and for The American Legion, I accept the verdict of the officers and men who have to bear the brunt of reality of unimpeded enemy effort in the field as opposed to all the fancy theory of those who are far removed from the scene of action and can speculate in comparative ease, comfort and security.

We have been told by our military commanders in the field, and we have no reason to disbelieve them, that the bombing of North Vietnam keeps a half million communists fully occupied on the home front maintaining anti-aircraft defenses, rebuilding and repairing the damage from bombing raids, trying to keep factories operating, and rebuilding bridges and repairing roads and trails over which men and supplies are moved from North Vietnam to confront our own troops in combat.

As opposed to the arm-chair general's theories, the generals who are charged with the conduct of this war are convinced that our bombing is serving a very useful purpose. They believe it has hampered the enemy's ability to wage war. They believe it is damaging his morals. They believe it is effective. They believe it is necessary. I believe them and, incidentally, I don't believe I have been brainwashed.

The American Legion has gone on record, through action of our National Convention, in favor of removing political restrictions governing the actions of our military commanders, and having seen our commanders in action I am more firmly convinced than ever that this is a proper position.

If Americans at home were as firmly convinced of the propriety of our position in Vietnam as are the Americans who are doing the job in the field, I believe we would be farther along the road to victory than we are today. I assure you that it will be an important part of my work this year as National Commander of The American Legion to help convince the unbelievers.

We could speak at length of the voices of dissent here at home, and The American

Legion has said repeatedly that we do not contest the right of dissent and that we recognize the people peaceably to assemble to air their grievances and to seek redress of those grievances, real or imagined.

We seriously question the peaceable nature of any protest or expression of dissent, such as one which is said to be planned for our nation's capital this coming weekend, and which has as its announced objective the disruption of our country's defense establishment.

The best thing that could happen to this whole project would be for it to fall completely. We have heard that extraordinary precautions are being taken by both civilian and military authority in and around Washington, D.C., to prevent any acts of lawlessness by these misguided people. We trust they will be well prepared to thwart any lawless effort to cripple the Pentagon, even momentarily.

People who promote demonstrations of this type are those who fail to recognize that Freedom Is Not Free. The freedom they enjoy, they take for granted. They recoil at the thought of paying the price that freedom demands. They would impede the efforts of those who are paying that price.

We have passed the stage of permissiveness. Now we must put the foolishness behind us and give our total support to our men in Vietnam who everyday write history and record new proof that Freedom Is Not Free.

THE JOB CORPS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Director of the Job Corps, Mr. W. P. Kelly, which I feel is very significant.

He calls my attention to an editorial in the *Livermore, Calif., Herald & News* in which he takes justifiable pride, as it commends the Job Corps.

But what is equally significant is his condemnation of the protesters who stormed the doors of the Pentagon this past weekend, for in his letter to me, he states:

As you can see from the editorial, Job Corpsmen are not storming the doors of the Pentagon, nor are they burning their draft cards or turning them in. They are, on the other hand, learning to accept all responsibilities of good citizenship—from financial independence to serving their country in the Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter and the editorial be placed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1967.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Member, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: As a Member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I think you will be interested in the attached editorial, which appeared in the *Livermore, California Herald and News*, October 19, 1967.

As you can see from the editorial, Job Corpsmen are not storming the doors of the Pentagon, nor are they burning their draft cards or turning them in. They are, on the other hand, learning to accept all responsibilities of good citizenship—from financial independence to serving their country in the Armed Forces.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

W. P. KELLY,
Director, Job Corps.

CONTEMPORARY CONTRASTS

Two current developments in Alameda County provide an interesting study in contrasts and inspire comment on a variety of topics, such as "rights," "patriotism" and "moral right."

One development is the besieging of the Northern California Induction Center at Oakland as part of a nationwide "anti-draft" movement. These protesters are exercising their "right to assemble," and their "right of free speech."

The other development is that of about 40 Parks Job Corpsmen enlisting in the first Job Corps paratroop platoon. They are part of a goodly number of corpsmen enlisting at Parks in all branches of military service.

One of the contrasts began with a comment by a corpsman when he was asked how he felt about the protests at the induction centers: "I don't think most of them even know what they're protesting about."

This was from a young Los Angeles white man. He sat with two other paratroop enlistees, a Negro from Philadelphia and a Georgia-born Negro from Cleveland. All were from the ghettos, all from areas where protests have occurred and violence has flared, all high school dropouts, all considered by many Americans as "hoodlums."

It's an odd commentary that patriotism, which some claim has all but passed from the American scene, should be sounded so strongly from the throats of the minority which has made "organized protests" and "civil disobedience" watchwords of the 1960s. This is quite a contrast. Certainly it proves that all members of the vociferous minorities are not at the induction centers protesting.

But the corpsman's comment and the youths' actions in enlisting to fight in a war so many detest also provides a starting point for a commentary on the more basic issues of "rights" and "right."

The commentary is simply this: Does the "right" to protest against the Vietnam war include the "right" to prevent another man from exercising his right to be patriotic and serve his nation? Isn't the right to protest merely the legal privilege to give voice to one's conscience? And isn't that right distributed equally among all men—especially in a democracy?

The contrast between "under-privileged hoodlum" boys exercising simple, old-fashioned and strangely welcome patriotism and the literate, articulate citizens joining a mass protest is one we can perhaps take heart from. But then, simple things often bring the most hope.

THE WAVE OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I was much impressed by an address by Lewis F. Powell, Jr., former president of the American Bar Association, which was reprinted in full in the current issue of *U.S. News & World Report* magazine.

Mr. Powell takes as his theme the wave of civil disobedience which has swept the country in recent years, and which I regard as one of the most critical problems facing America today. Also, I think it is significant that increasing numbers of Americans are coming to realize that in a free and orderly society we cannot have people going about the country taking the law into their own hands, preaching racial hatred and disrespect for all established authority, and telling the people that they have a right to decide for themselves what laws ought to be obeyed and what laws ought to be disobeyed.

Mr. Powell is to be commended for his outstanding discussion of this problem,

and I was particularly impressed by the fact that his well-documented address calls names and places blame where I believe blame belongs. I commend this article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION?

(NOTE.—Are the militant advocates of "black power" and the New Left blazing a trail that will lead to the destruction of this country? A distinguished attorney examines the implications of their calls for defiance of the law—and warns of the results.)

(By Lewis F. Powell, Jr., former president, American Bar Association)

This will be a lawyer's talk about law and order and civil disobedience. The subject is related to complex social and economic problems—some of the most perplexing of any age. But there is no hope of solving these problems unless an ordered society is preserved.

There is deep concern today about the disquieting trend—so evident in our country—toward organized lawlessness and even rebellion. One of the contributing causes is the doctrine of civil disobedience. This heresy was dramatically associated with the civil-rights movement by the famous letter of [the Rev. Dr.] Martin Luther King from a Birmingham jail.

As rationalized by Dr. King, some laws are "just" and others "unjust"; each person may determine for himself which laws are "unjust"; and each is free—indeed even morally bound—to violate the "unjust" laws.

Coming at a time when discriminatory State and local laws still existed in the South, civil disobedience was quickly enthroned as a worthy doctrine. It met the need of intellectuals and theologians for a moral and philosophical justification of conduct which, by all previous standards, was often lawless and indefensible.

HOW PROTEST MOVEMENT HAS CHANGED

Initially, disobedience tactics were directed specifically against discriminatory laws. The sit-ins and demonstrations were aimed primarily at segregated facilities and denial of voting rights—largely in the South. But as the use of disobedience tactics expanded, the relationship between the act of protest and the law protested became increasingly attenuated.

Indeed, as the protest movement expanded to Northern and Western cities, its objectives broadened from specific discriminatory laws and practices of the South to the age-old social and economic problems of bias, poverty and unemployment. Predictably, disobedience tactics were soon employed in other causes—on the campus and across our country. Few voices spoke out against civil disobedience. Because of its association with the cause of civil rights, criticism of disobedience and its tactics was largely muted. Many persons of good will—including many clergymen and campus intellectuals—were so enchanted by the "causes" that they gave little thought to the means employed or to where the disobedience road would lead.

But all who advocated civil disobedience were not so naive. Political activists and extremists of all kinds were quick to recognize the potential of this doctrine as an extralegal means of attaining goals—and even of promoting revolution. Moreover, a doctrine which tolerates and justifies disobedience of law—implemented by sit-ins and street mobs—is made to order for cynical leaders promoting rebellion and other extremist causes.

One of the few national leaders who had both the insight and the courage to speak out against civil-disobedience tactics was Mr. Justice Hugo Black [of the Supreme Court]. Writing early in 1966, he said:

"Governments like ours were formed to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force. Illustrations may be given where crowds have gathered together peaceably by reason of extraordinarily good discipline reinforced by vigilant officers. Demonstrations have taken place without any manifestations of force at the time. But I say once more that the crowd moved by noble ideals today can become the mob ruled by hate and passion and greed and violence tomorrow. If we ever doubted that, we know it now. The peaceful songs of love can become as stirring and provocative as the 'Marseillaise' did in the days when a noble revolution gave way to rule by successive mobs until chaos set in. . . . It . . . [is] more necessary than ever that we stop and look more closely at where we are going."

It is notable that Mr. Justice Black wrote these prophetic words in February, 1966, before the emergence of "black power" as an overt doctrine, and prior to the riots of 1966 and 1967.

But few heeded his warning. Despite clearly visible danger signals, political, religious and intellectual leaders continued to tolerate and justify civil disobedience—even after such major eruptions as Watts [in Los Angeles], Cleveland and Chicago.

There seemed to be a curious unawareness that once lawlessness is tolerated and justified it feeds upon itself and leads either to revolution or violent repressive measures. It has been said wisely:

"Once you give a nervous, hostile and ill-informed people a theoretical justification for using violence in certain cases, it is like a tiny hole in the dike; the rationales rush through in a torrent, and violence becomes the normal, acceptable solution for a problem. . . . A cardinal fact about violence is that once initiated it tends to get out of hand. Its limits are not predictable."

So much for a review—obviously incomplete—of the origin and escalation of contemporary civil disobedience. This brings us to the year 1967—a year of crisis in which the symptoms of incipient revolution are all too evident.

Two movements have been emerging: (1) a militant Negro nationalist movement, summed up in the slogan "black power," and (2) a radical political movement called the New Left or New Politics, which hopes to change our form of government. The two movements have been converging, and now pursue the common causes of "black power" and frustration of America's attempt to contain Communism in Vietnam. Both of these movements rely heavily upon civil-disobedience tactics.

The public is widely aware of the Negro revolt. There is far less awareness of the New Left, its organizations and its radical goals. There are a number of New Left groups with varying degrees of militancy. Although not yet coalesced into a single organization, they are moving toward a united front—certainly on race and Vietnam issues.

THE WARNINGS OF MILITANT LEADERS

Most Americans—of both races—have been shocked and dismayed by a summer of unprecedented discord. The great majority of Negro citizens have been as dismayed as the whites. Yet, the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pleasures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a childlike disbelief that this land of the free—internally secure for 100 years—may be confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale. Complacent Americans would be well advised to heed the warnings of the militant leaders. Here are some

random examples of what they are saying and planning—quite openly:

Stokely Carmichael—Mr. Carmichael has allied himself and "black power" with revolutionary Communism. Speaking at Havana, he said:

"There are no longer any isolated struggles. They are all correlated. . . . The only solution is armed struggle."

H. Rap Brown—Still at large, and even invited to speak in churches, Mr. Brown openly advocates violence and revolution. In language more racist than that of a Klansman, he urges:

"Get you some guns—(and) burn this town down."

"We'll make the Viet Cong look like Sunday-school teachers. Violence is necessary."

Dr. Martin Luther King—The prophet of civil disobedience, Dr. King, seems bewildered at times by the escalation of his own doctrine. On occasion he has joined moderate Negro leaders in criticizing riots. But he is arm-in-arm with Mr. Carmichael and Mr. McKissick (Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality) in slandering his own Government and in inciting violation of draft laws. He has said: "America is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today."

And he has compared the use of new American weapons in Vietnam to the Nazi testing of "new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe."

Dr. King's favorite role is organizing disruptive demonstrations. He is now urging "massive civil disobedience" for the purpose of "dislocating" Northern cities. He is planning such "nonviolent" tactics as weekly school boycotts, blocking plant gates with unemployed Negroes, and disrupting governmental operations with sit-in demonstrations in federal buildings.

CORE leaders—Although CORE has received support from the Ford Foundation and other responsible parties, its leaders are now committed to "black power" extremism.

Mr. McKissick, replying to a question by a white reporter as to what the Negro wanted, put in quite simply in the classic terms of revolution:

"The answer is—everything you got right now, and everything you hope to get."

A "New York Times" story reported that CORE's No. 2 leader, Wilfred Ussery, believes that: "Armed conflict between black and white can no longer be averted."

Father James Groppi—A newcomer to dubious prominence is Father Groppi, a Milwaukee Catholic priest. Working with the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] Youth Council, he has organized and led paralyzing demonstrations for open housing. The "liberal" mayor of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier, charges that Father Groppi is "trying to incite riots," and that "rational discussions with him are impossible." Father Groppi has recently been quoted as saying: "Morally, I have no argument against the black man's right to use violence."

Dr. Benjamin Spock—Dr. Spock, a New Leftist dilettante, also has joined those who condone rebellion. Speaking at the recent Conference on New Politics, he said:

"The situation in America is desperate. The principal sign of it is the revolt of our black fellow citizens. . . . The Founding Fathers declared that people who are oppressed, and can find no other redress, must rebel."

Staughton Lynd—Mr. Lynd, a Yale faculty member on leave and an intellectual leader of the New Left, made an unauthorized trip to Hanoi. He insists that representative democracy is outmoded; that we must substitute a "participatory democracy"—which apparently would function through mass meetings and demonstrations. In a revealing article in "The New York Times Magazine" section, Mr. Lynd argues that the uprisings

in the cities have been "rebellions" and not riots; and—citing the American Revolution and other irrelevant precedents—he justifies the Carmichaels and the Browns and their call for revolution.

The foregoing are only a few—if among the better known—of the leaders of militant civil disobedience. Their roles and views differ, and I do not suggest that each is equally responsible for the lawlessness which threatens to engulf our country. Yet these, and hundreds of lesser-known leaders, are men determined to remake America—not by the democratic processes of our institutions but by varying forms and degrees of coercion. The more radical of these leaders, like Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Brown, are openly advocating revolution.

Let us turn now from the leaders to examples of extremism in action.

The first is Vietnam Week of last April, when tens of thousands marched in New York and San Francisco. Draft cards were burned, placards of hate displayed, and vicious anti-American speeches made by Dr. King, Mr. Carmichael and Dr. Spock.

The initial planning for Vietnam Week took place at a Chicago conference, instigated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. The Communist-line objectives of Vietnam Week were to undermine United States opposition to Communism in Vietnam and to ferment racial discord.

Shortly following these marches, Dr. King announced the formation of "Vietnam Summer"—a coalition of opponents to American policy and includes well-known Communist allies and other luminaries of the "hate America" left. The avowed objective is "to organize opposition to the war in ghetto areas," and encourage our youth to "refuse to fight."

As Dean Joseph O'Meara of Notre Dame Law School has said, many of these who thus aid the Communist enemy "give themselves away":

"For never once do they condemn the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese; never once do they condemn Hanoi's rejection of all peace proposals; . . . never once do they lament the suffering and death borne by our forces in Vietnam. These persons weep only for the enemy."

FURTHER INROADS BY COMMUNISTS

Having attained some success and notoriety through Vietnam Week, the New Leftists then planned and held what was called the "National Conference on New Politics," attended by some 5,000 delegates. Its stated purpose was to create a united front among groups supporting the "black power" and "peace" movements. Dr. King and Dr. Spock were among the principal speakers. The Communist Party, as in the case of Vietnam Week, was active in the planning and manipulation.

The conference, dominated by "black power" militants, condemned "the savage and beastlike character that runs rampant through America, as exemplified by the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Lyndon B. Johnsons." It also adopted a straight Communist Party line resolution, which pledged "total and unquestioning support to all national peoples' liberation wars . . . particularly in Vietnam."

The flavor of the New Politics Conference was summed up by Walter Goodman, writing in "The New York Times Magazine," who said: "It stunk of totalitarianism."

Vietnam Week and the Conference on New Politics are chilling examples of growing extremism in this country. The dominant themes of both were hatred of fellow Americans and contempt for our institutions. Their goals are to be attained not by democratic processes but by various techniques of civil disobedience.

One of the major targets is American policy in Vietnam, now under virulent at-

tack. Reasonable men may well differ as to the wisdom of this policy. But only those who are blinded by their prejudices, or who are indifferent to the consequences of lawlessness, will deliberately incite disobedience of valid laws.

A most recent example of this irresponsibility is the public demand by a group of some 320 clergymen, educators and writers that churches and synagogues be used as "sanctuaries" for youths who defy the draft law. If thousands of young men refused to fight for their country, as pointed out by Tom Wicker of "The New York Times," "the power (of the Government) to pursue the Vietnam war or any other policy would be crippled if not destroyed. The Government would then be faced, not with dissent, but with civil disobedience on a scale amounting to revolt."

Or, suppose the campaign against payment of income taxes gains widespread support. This is not an illogical possibility, as this relatively bland form of civil disobedience has appeal to a broad spectrum of disaffected citizens. But however appealing it may be, widespread refusal to pay taxes could bring orderly government to a halt.

So much for examples of nonviolent—though potentially disastrous—disobedience. But the greater concern has been the violent eruptions in our cities—where civil disobedience has reached its ultimate form.

I do not know whether any of the persons or groups named above was legally implicated in any of these riots. Let us assume no such implication. Yet few can doubt that the cumulative effect of the black-nationalist movement, and of the incitements to hatred and disobedience were major contributing factors. As J. Edgar Hoover [Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation] has said:

"Those who espouse the theory of civil disobedience and authorities who free guilty violators must share a portion of the blame and responsibility for the turmoil in our streets."

There have been riots or major disorders in some 75 cities in 1967. Detroit was the shocker, with 43 killed, hundreds injured and part of a great city destroyed. A less likely city for a race riot would be hard to find. Detroit had no housing ghetto; its Negro population was largely prosperous, and its race relations considered excellent.

The recent NBC documentary—in which Daniel P. Moynihan [director of the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Affairs] participated—contains a frightening analysis of the riot and the future prospects. Although apparently spontaneous in its inception, militant organized groups took over promptly, supplied the weapons, the Molotov cocktails, and directed the sniping and the arson. This was no revolt of oppressed people against local conditions. It was armed rebellion against American society.

Although the underlying causes are complex and deep-seated, America's acceptance of civil disobedience was both a cause and a justification. Mr. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, put it this way:

"We have legitimized opposition to the police and disobedience to law. Now in the North it has become massive opposition to the rules of white society."

The Negro militant viewpoint, gaining increasing support, is that America is "irredeemably racist"; that Negroes should "forget America," and that the "only course for Negroes is to bring about a final, violent apocalyptic confrontation of black and white."

The NBC investigating team concluded that extremists already are planning future violence. Next time, it is said, they will attack and destroy the white sections of Detroit and other cities. As Frank McGee described it: "These black extremists are willing and eager to risk a bloody showdown with white society."

Sharing the same pessimism, [columnist] Roscoe Drummond recently said: "The black militants and their white associates are irreversibly committed to the destruction of American democratic society to achieve their racist goals."

GRAVEST POTENTIAL FOR DISASTER

One may hope that the views of these observers—competent as they are—exaggerate the danger. But none can doubt that America faces a crisis of lawlessness with the gravest potential for disaster.

No man knows all the answers, but to me—as a lawyer—some simple truths are self-evident:

An ordered society governed by the rule of law must be preserved. Without law and order, none of the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution can be safeguarded—for whites or blacks, "radicals," "liberals" or "conservatives." History has demonstrated that once a society condones defiance of law and due process, the liberties of all are lost in the excesses of anarchy which follow.

With these truths in mind, and if our cherished institutions are to be preserved, Americans of good will—of both races—must act together to assure the following:

1. Toleration of civil disobedience and justification of lawlessness must end—in government, in the pulpits, among the media, and on the ivory-towered campuses.

2. Those who incite riots and rebellion should be treated as the most dangerous of criminals and relentlessly prosecuted. The irresolution of our society is attested by the fact that we hasten to put petty criminals in prison and yet permit the Carmichaels and Browns to remain free. Indeed, some still dignify their criminality by inviting them to speak in our schools and churches.

3. Those who participate in riots and rebellion should also be prosecuted with vigor, particularly the arsonists and the snipers.

4. Criminal laws, at all levels of government, should be reviewed and strengthened to deal specifically with the foregoing crimes in light of present conditions. Penalties should be adequate to deter criminal conduct, and justice should be swift and certain.

5. Effective gun control laws should be adopted at State and federal levels; sniping at policemen and firemen should be made special offenses with severe penalties, and possession or use of Molotov cocktails should be serious crimes.

6. Those who incite and participate in nonviolent civil disobedience should also be subjected to criminal sanctions. Where needed, laws should be clarified and strengthened with appropriate penalties provided. This is a more difficult area, as First Amendment freedoms must be carefully safeguarded. But rights of free speech and peaceful assembly do not justify incitement to revolt or the willful violation of draft laws, income tax laws, or court decrees.

7. Laws, especially against those who engage in nonviolent civil disobedience, should be enforced uniformly and promptly. A few draft-law violators have been prosecuted, but most have been ignored—including the radical leaders who incite draft evasion. Public authorities have also failed to prosecute the growing number of dissidents who willfully refuse to pay all of their income taxes. How can officials sworn to uphold the law ignore its willful violation? In justice, how can a Cassius Clay [former heavyweight boxing champion] be sent to jail for draft evasion, while prominent self-styled intellectuals who refuse to pay their taxes are allowed to remain free?

8. In summary, America needs to awaken to its peril; it needs to understand that our society and system can be destroyed. Indeed, this can and will happen here unless Americans develop a new impatience with those

who incite and perpetrate civil disobedience; unless laws against violence and disorder are strengthened, and enforced with vigor and impartiality; and unless we return once more to the orderly and democratic processes which alone can preserve our freedoms.

Now, a final caveat. I have spoken as a lawyer, deeply conscious that the rule of law in America is under unprecedented attack. There are, of course, other grave problems and other areas calling for determined and even generous action. The gap between the prosperous middle classes and the genuinely underprivileged—both white and black—must be narrowed. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. But we have passed the point where recriminations and bitterness will solve problems.

We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of this century. America has the resources, and our people have the compassion and the desire, to provide equal justice, adequate education and job opportunities for all. This we surely must do.

AVOID FOLLY OF REWARDING EXTREMISTS

At the same time, we must avoid the mindless folly of appeasing and even rewarding the extremists who incite or participate in civil disobedience. There must be a clearer understanding that those who preach, practice and condone lawlessness are the enemies of social reform and of freedom itself. In short, the one indispensable prerequisite to all progress is an ordered society governed by the rule of law.

WESTMORELAND FORCES HAVE VIETCONG ALL BUT OVER A BARREL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, from Saigon, which appeared in the October 23, 1967, edition of the Washington Post, and which was titled "Westmoreland Forces Have Vietcong All but Over a Barrel."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTMORELAND FORCES HAVE VIETCONG ALL BUT OVER A BARREL

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—After a month spent in a dozen different provinces and three of the four corps areas of South Vietnam, one leaves really bewildered by the defeatism that seems to prevail at home. There is no stalemate here. And by any rational test, Gen. William C. Westmoreland at last has the other side over a barrel.

The barrel consists of a basic contradiction. On the one hand, every observable sign—in the field, in the POW and defector interrogation, and in ton upon ton of captured documents—points to a central conclusion about the VC guerrilla base in the countryside and their control of the population.

The conclusion is that this VC base in its instruments of control cannot long survive without the active, fairly close-in support of the big units—the enemy's "main force" divisions, regiments and battalions, which are now chiefly North Vietnamese in three-quarters of the country.

On the other hand, every observable sign—again in both the field and the documents—points to an equally important conclusion about the "big unit war," as it is called here. This first phase of the war, which has endured since the American intervention, has in fact come to an end. The reason is that the North Vietnamese cannot pay the immense manpower bill for supporting the am-

bitious troop structure of big units they have deployed in South Vietnam.

That does not mean that there will be no more big units—for the Hanoi war-planners quite certainly dare not go as far as a complete return to classical, small unit guerrilla fighting. The effort to pin down American forces along the mislabeled Demilitarized Zone may well be continued, to relieve pressure farther south.

In addition, the effort to keep in being some sort of big units—perhaps battalions instead of regiments and divisions—will certainly be continued in a good many areas, where this support is essential to the survival of the VC base in important and populous provinces. Yet the barrel will still be there, as can be seen by a glance at II Corps, for instance.

In II Corps, as recently as six months ago, there were supposed to be two full enemy divisions on the western border, in the Cambodian sanctuary. This was already a bit of an overestimate, yet the North Vietnamese troops of this "B-3 Front" were still fighting aggressively and continuously at that time. An entire U.S. Division, the Fourth Infantry, was engaged against them.

Only a few days ago, in contrast, Gen. Westmoreland returned from an inspection of the border with the conviction that the remaining regiments of the B-3 Front had been "degraded (as our army now so strangely says) to replacement depots." Obviously, this kind of diminution of the Cambodian sanctuary's threat will also diminish the U.S. troop requirement there.

Suppose, then, that only one U.S. brigade is needed to keep the border guard. That will free two more brigades for use in the populous and important coastal provinces of II Corps. And here the other side is already in dreadful shape.

On the coast, the Third and Fifth North Vietnamese have long since been torn to rags and tatters. But precisely because they are desperately needed to support the VC base in populous provinces (a need the documents show), these two unhappy divisions now have complete replacement priority. Even this replacement priority has failed to bring them back to effective life, however.

Increase the pressure here still further, as Gen. Westmoreland can so easily do if the big unit threat diminishes elsewhere, then the remnant of the big unit threat in the coastal province can also be eliminated. Whereupon the VC base and the VC population control will ravel away, for want of big unit support. And the coastal provinces will then be largely cleared.

This is, of course, far too schematic a description of what is necessarily a very complex process. As experience in vital Binh Dinh Province shows, for instance, the raveling away of the VC base goes by stages. It is very fast at first, when the VC majority are killed or captured or defect. It slows down after that, when none but the ultra-hard-core minority of VC activists are left to be scooped up.

There are differences, too, from province to province, and from corps area to corps area. In III Corps, for instance, the famous Ninth VC Division may well be kept in being; while the two other divisions are broken down or wither away. Yet there is still that barrel, always at work.

If the big unit threat ends or even drops off at Point X, in other words, Gen. Westmoreland can intensify the pressure at Point Y—primarily in the most populous provinces, where the big units are harder to keep up to strength, too, than they are on the remote borders. If the pressure is increased enough at Point Y, the second stage of raveling away is reached. Point Z will then key in to feel more pressure. And so it must continue, with the same contradiction always bedeviling the enemy.

THE TWO WARS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] and I were among those who participated in the Methodist Dakota Convocation at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on October 7. Senator McGovern's address to the convocation was entitled "The Two Wars." I believe that many Senators would be interested in reading his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO WARS

(An address by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Methodist Dakota Convocation, Aberdeen, S. Dak., October 7, 1967)

President Briggs, Bishop Garrison, Bishop Heininger, and my fellow Methodists, the last time I talked to a churchmen's audience of this size in South Dakota was nearly ten years ago, when at the annual Methodist Conference I shared the stage as a freshman Congressman with then Governor Joe Foss.

In his opening remarks, Joe was relating the good things that come to us as Methodists—and he brought the house down when he said: "Most of what I know about politics I learned in the Methodist Church!"

I wouldn't put it quite that way, but I grew up in a Wesleyan Methodist parsonage, and my brother-in-law is an E. U. B. minister now on the staff at Westmar College. That has given me at least some of the armor one needs for political combat!

In any event, the more I grapple with the great issues of public life—both domestic and international—the more I come to realize that their solution depends upon the moral insights of the church.

Our nation and our world literally cry for the gospel of love and the healing power of brotherhood. If that cry is not heard, I tremble for the future of our beloved country and for the peace of mankind. As W. H. Auden puts it: "We must love one another, or die." It is in that spirit that today I want to talk about two wars—the war against hunger, and the war in Vietnam.

In recent months, we have moved from crisis to crisis both at home and abroad.

This past summer, to paraphrase Steinbeck, has been "the summer of our discontent."

It began with the eruption of the Middle East—that crucial area we call the Holy Land which gave us the Prince of Peace, but which has not found the ways that make for peace these 2,000 years.

Then came the tragic explosions in our great cities—Newark, Detroit, Cleveland, Milwaukee—with violence and destruction involving billions of dollars, lost lives, and blasted neighborhoods.

And then there is Vietnam—poor, suffering Vietnam—an obscure little jungle strip in Southeast Asia that has been drenched in blood continuously for a quarter of a century—a cockpit of hatred and violence that has killed 15,000 young Americans and maimed or wounded another 85,000—a confusing, interminable struggle which is swallowing \$30 billion a year in American treasure while exhausting the energies of our leaders from the President on down.

Yet, victory eludes us and old friends desert us.

We started out as advisors and then as assistants—but somehow we now seem to carry the burden alone towards a steadily widening war that grows more costly and more uncertain with each day.

Yet, during this time of national testing—a time when we wonder if we may have temporarily lost our way as a nation—the world cries out to us for leadership and help.

While we grapple with the violence of our

cities, the war in Vietnam, a skyrocketing military budget, and falling agricultural prices—most of the rest of mankind groans under the pain of those ancient enemies—hunger, misery and tyranny.

My first face-to-face encounter with the world's pain came in February 1961 when on a Food for Peace mission to Northeast Brazil, I stood on the mud floor of a little hut where a family was having their noon-day meal. Lying with their heads on their mother's lap were two frail children, their eyes open but without childish light. A seven-year-old brother had died the day before of smallpox aggravated by the debilitating malnutrition endemic to the area. "She is the symbol of the underdeveloped country," said the Brazilian economist who was with me as he saw me staring at the shapeless, prematurely aged mother. In the next 18 months I was to see that scene repeated countless times around the globe.

For us, the supplication "Give us this day our daily bread" is a hymn of thanksgiving for our bounty—but for the Brazilian mother, or the Indian peasant, or the African villager—it is a cry born of man's deepest physical need—the cry for sustenance.

America has done much in the last two decades to heed that cry:

We helped to launch the United Nations as an international forum of peace and international assistance;

We financed through the Marshall Plan the reconstruction of Western Europe and Japan;

We have launched the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and Food for Peace.

But today, our entire annual overseas assistance does not equal what we spend in Vietnam in one month. The war cost is equivalent to \$5,000 a year for every family in Vietnam.

If a band of ragged Vietcong peasants is spotted hiding in the jungle, we are prepared to launch a \$20 million B-52 bombing raid to demolish them.

But what about the silent enemy that lurks in the jungle—old man hunger—that grim reaper who steals away the children at night in 10,000 villages around the globe—hunger, which says the energy of the student, the worker, the housewife—hunger, the chief killer and warper of mankind—hunger, the chief barrier to a peaceful, orderly developing world.

It is in the swamplands of hunger that Communism breeds.

It is injustice, and misery, and bad government that set the stage for Vietnam and are even now creating the breeding grounds for future Vietnams and future Cubas and future Mideast crises. There is no peace or freedom in the world of the hungry.

Would it not make more sense to concentrate on fire prevention rather than waiting until the fires of violence begin to rage—whether in the ghettos of Harlem or the jungles of Southeast Asia?

Can we afford to continue on our present course of pouring more and more of the blood and treasure of America into Vietnam to the neglect of our own nation and at the risk of a growing catastrophe abroad?

This is not a question of "hawks" or "doves." I despise those labels which cover up the central question we ought to be asking: namely, Is the steady enlargement of this war in our national interest and does it contribute to the peace and well-being of mankind?

I have opposed our military involvement in this war from the beginning because I felt it was basically a civil war—a family quarrel between two groups of Vietnamese which only they could resolve—even as we once fought and resolved a civil war between the North and the South in our country.

In the South, we have our ally, General Ky, who has said that his only hero is Adolf

Hitler. In the North, we have Ho Chi Minh, whose hero is Karl Marx.

Frankly, I am not very enthusiastic about either one of them. Neither one has any claim on the protection of the American flag—a symbol of human dignity and freedom.

Our basic mistake in Vietnam is one that I have been warning against for four years: we are trying to solve a political problem with military power from the outside and it just can't be done.

The political problem is that the people of South Vietnam do not have enough respect for their government to fight for it. While we have been sending 500,000 brave Americans to Vietnam, 200,000 South Vietnamese troops have deserted and gone home.

Secretary McNamara reported after his last visit to South Vietnam that while our marines and pilots and soldiers are dying at the rate of a thousand a month, the streets of Saigon are filled with draft-age youth who are not being called or who have deserted. He could have added that Saigon is also swarming with profiteers ranging from bar girls to large-scale black marketeers who are exploiting our troops and our taxpayers for their own selfish gain.

The South Vietnamese army and their government are riddled by corrupt, self-seeking generals and officials who are diverting American tax dollars and supplies to their own coffers. The land reform and social justice which we have begged the South Vietnamese officials to undertake has been put off by their ruling families—families who have always turned their backs on the peasant.

The South Vietnamese people are tired of this war and are giving it little support. It is fast becoming an American burden that we carry alone.

The clearest signal to come out of the September 3 Vietnamese election was the desire of the people of South Vietnam to settle the war on whatever terms are possible.

If the South Vietnamese really believed in their own government, they would have won this war long ago, considering the enormous support they have had from us.

I was startled to learn the other day that we are pouring more aid into South Vietnam each month than the total North Vietnam has received from all of its allies in the last ten years.

Apparently, the Vietnamese people believe that their government and their leaders are not worthy of their support.

The distinguished war correspondent, Peter Arnett, has written:

"The dispirited Vietnamese army, shot through with inefficiency, often lacks the will for combat and is increasingly prone to let the Americans do the fighting.

"Fighting statistics and a detailed survey of field operations bear out this observation. In much of the country the Vietnamese military effort has steadily tailed off as that of the Americans increased."

Why should we ask American troops and pilots to die for a government in South Vietnam that doesn't have the respect and support of its own people?

Why should we ask the American taxpayer to pay \$30 billion a year to finance a war in Vietnam that the people there don't really believe in?

We can't export freedom and political strength to Asia in a B-52. We can't make the people of the South love their government by bombing the North.

I have long opposed our policy in Vietnam because I thought it was neither in our national interest nor theirs. I will continue to vote for appropriations that are necessary to defend our men. But I will work even harder to change the policy that is committing so many young Americans to the Southeast Asian jungle.

The Aberdeen editor wrote yesterday that we must back our boys with patriotic cour-

age. Well, it doesn't take either patriotism or courage to stand on the curbstone, or in our living rooms, or even on the Senate floor and cheer our boys on to their deaths. It is our soldiers—our sons—who will die, and not the cheerleaders.

The best way to back our boys in Vietnam is to change the political policy that sent them there.

Instead of sending in another 45,000 American troops as the President is now preparing to do, we should bring 45,000 home.

Why don't we say to the South Vietnamese government that the time has come either for them to begin carrying a larger share of their own defense, or else to end this war on whatever terms they can reach with the other side.

This may not be an entirely happy settlement, but the alternative is a bigger and bloodier war—rising casualty lists, skyrocketing expenditures, and perhaps World War III.

And in the end, after thousands more are dead, even if we win, what would we have won? If the Vietnamese people do not believe enough in their own government to fight for it, then a military victory by us would simply postpone the day when Saigon would fall into Vietcong hands politically.

It is sometimes said that we are in Vietnam to stop Communist China. I submit we are playing into the hands of Communist China. How can anyone argue that we are weakening China by throwing half a million of our best young men into war with Vietnam—a war which the Chinese watch from the sidelines without the loss of a single Chinese soldier? How are we teaching China a lesson when in fact our bombing of North Vietnam is driving Hanoi into a closer alliance with Peking?

Freedom is worth fighting for, but we do not meet the challenge of Communism or advance the cause of freedom by asking our men to die for an unpopular military regime abroad which denies freedom and which is scorned by its own citizens. I do not want to see Vietnam or any other country embrace Communism, but that is an issue which they must resolve for themselves.

I have never regretted my service as a bomber pilot in World War II against Hitlerism. But I agree with the late Winston Churchill that Vietnam is not that kind of testing ground for freedom. It is instead a confusing civil conflict with no real certainty as to which side has the more legitimate claim to lead the country. I do not want to see my son or your son die in that kind of doubtful struggle.

It is said that we must be patriotic and support our government in time of war. But the highest patriotism does not consist of blind acceptance of mistaken policies that are hurting our nation. Thoughtful people can honestly disagree on American foreign policy. But the strength of our system is that we encourage frank criticism and maximum candor in public debate. "To criticize one's country," said Senator Fulbright, "is to do it a service and pay it a compliment. It is a service because it may spur the country to do better than it is doing; it is a compliment because it evidences a belief that the country can do better than it is doing."

It is said that Hanoi misconstrues American dissent and public debate. But we cannot sacrifice freedom in America merely because it is not understood by those abroad who have never known freedom. We dare not fight so blindly for liberty in Southeast Asia that we lose it in America.

To remain silent in the face of policies we believe to be wrong is not patriotism; it is moral cowardice—a form of treason to one's conscience and to the nation.

It is not easy to dissent in time of war. Congressman Abraham Lincoln spoke out against the Mexican War in the 1840's and

his angry constituents drove him from the Congress after one term.

My courage has been more sorely tested on the Senate floor these past four years in warning against the Administration's Vietnam policy than on any one of the bombing missions I flew as a pilot against enemy anti-aircraft fire in the 1940's.

I do not know how all this will come out. I do know that while the people of a State can easily secure a new Senator, a Senator cannot easily secure a new conscience.

I cannot promise the people of South Dakota that my judgments will always prove to be 100% right. But I can promise to say what I believe is right. I do not expect everyone to agree with me on every issue, but I am convinced that you prefer me to say what I honestly believe rather than to pretend that I am in full agreement with official policy. And so while continuing to respect the equally sincere views of those who disagree with me, I intend to go right on speaking my views openly and frankly. I love the United States Senate. I want to be re-elected, and I am convinced that by experience and background I can serve more effectively in the future as your Senator. But I do not want re-election so badly that I will ever sacrifice my convictions to achieve it.

If we are fully honest with each other, we will sooner or later find through the free play of ideas an acceptable end to the war in Vietnam. After so much suffering and sacrifice on both sides the path to sanity and peace in Southeast Asia will not now be easy. The way to a larger war is enticing and simple. But before we plunge further down that path, let us recall the words of Virgil: "Easy is the descent to Hell; night and day the gates stand open; but to re-climb the slope and escape to the outer air, this, indeed, is a task."

The enormous destruction of life and property in Vietnam will have served no lasting purpose unless we learn well the lessons of this tragic conflict.

For the future, Senators and Administration leaders will do well to heed the admonition of Edmund Burke: "A conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in blood."

America has had a glorious tradition of respect for human dignity and freedom. We have had a record of unparalleled generosity in assisting others. We have for the most part used our great power with restraint.

I believe our people long for peace. The only war we really seek is the war against those ancient ills—hunger, tyranny and injustice. That is a war, not to kill and destroy, but to heal and to redeem.

If we can set our hand to that course, we shall one day come to know the Biblical promise: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

The author of Ecclesiastes has written that "to everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: . . . a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace."

This is not a time to keep silence; it is a time to speak. This is not a time to hate; it is a time to love. And may God grant that this time of war, with our help, may become a time of peace.

HANOI HAILS WASHINGTON PROTEST

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carried an account of Hanoi's reaction to last Saturday's anything-but-peaceful march on the Pentagon by the self-proclaimed National Mobilization Committee.

As might be expected, Hanoi was not

unhappy at the violence and magnitude of the demonstration.

The Times writer, Charles Mohr, writes in quoting North Vietnamese news sources, that—

The demonstrations constitute a great encouragement for our people.

This seems to give considerable weight to the question framed yesterday by the Secretary of State when he asked:

How do we prevent their (Hanoi's) misunderstanding the news that 40,000 or 50,000 people are demonstrating in front of the Pentagon?

Mr. President, while the right of dissent may be sacred to our way of life, the form of the dissent and the dissenters themselves are not. Nor does the right of dissent cleanse the hands of those who, through their actions, may be directly responsible for prolonging a bloody and indecisive war.

Those who dissent in the fashion of last Saturday's march on the Pentagon should not do so as "peace" marchers. By their actions, they are, in all likelihood, prolonging the war they ostensibly oppose.

I ask, Mr. President, that the New York Times article to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANOI HAILS PROTESTS IN WASHINGTON AGAINST WAR IN VIETNAM AS A GREAT ENCOURAGEMENT

(By Charles Mohr)

HONG KONG, October 25.—North Vietnamese spokesmen termed today the recent demonstrations in Washington against the war in Vietnam "valuable support," for and "a great encouragement" to North Vietnam.

A lengthy discussion on the protest demonstrations of last Saturday and Sunday was carried by the official North Vietnamese press service, the Vietnam News Agency.

The press service transmitted the text of an editorial in the newspaper Nhan Dan, official organ of the North Vietnamese Communist party that said "the American people's growing movement against the U.S. ruling circles' aggression in Vietnam constitutes a valuable support for the Vietnamese people. We warmly hail the struggle."

In another dispatch, the Vietnam News Agency quoted an official of "the Fatherland Front Central Committee" as having said in a speech yesterday that the Washington rallies "marked a new step in the development of the movement in the United States against the Johnson Government's war of aggression in Vietnam."

CREATED BY HO CHI MINH

The Fatherland Front is the last and most exclusive of the front organizations created by Ho Chi Minh in recent decades to broaden support for the regime. It includes some nominally non-Communist elements. It is not believed to exercise real power.

Nguyen Xien, a member of the Presidium of the Fatherland Front, told an audience in Hanoi that "together with the world peoples' movement of solidarity with Vietnam and against U.S. aggression, it [the demonstrations] constitutes a great encouragement to our people."

The National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong guerrilla movement in South Vietnam, created a social group recently that hopes to get in touch

with and encourage members of the anti-war movement in the United States.

MESSAGE TO U.S. COMMITTEE

Some political sources speculated today that the Fatherland Front's mass meeting yesterday might be a step in the same direction by the Hanoi Government itself.

Delegates at the meeting sent a message to the National Mobilization Committee to end the War in Vietnam which organized the Washington rallies, the Vietnam News Agency said. The message "warmly welcomed the success of the week of protest."

Mr. Xien said the people of North Vietnam rejoiced at the protests in Washington and in European capitals. He said, "We are all the more confident in the victory of our just fight and will be united still more closely to defeat the U.S. aggressors."

The Nhan Dan editorial also seemed to suggest that Hanoi would like to play some direct role in the antiwar movement in the United States. The editorial concluded with these words:

"By coordinating actions on both fronts in Vietnam and the United States and stepping up the struggle against their common enemy, the Vietnamese and American peoples will unquestionably defeat the U.S. imperialist aggressors."

Nhan Dan said an important aspect of the Washington rallies was that they marked the end of protest and the start of a "fierce struggle" against the war.

"The campaign in the U.S. for an end to Johnson's aggressive war in Vietnam has entered 'a stage of active resistance,'" Nhan Dan said.

"It is no longer a mere manifestation of the American people's disapproval of U.S. intervention and aggression in Vietnam but a firm action aimed at staying the hands of the U.S. ruling circles and a demand to them to stop the aggressive war in Vietnam."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, too often we at the Federal level have a tendency to legislate in a manner which we consider good for the country when, in fact, the program created may be a monster to administer at the local level. The result of this is programs that are complicated by redtape and delays, and are more trouble than they are worth. Luckily, there are organizations which represent local administrators and can advise Congress on the merits of suggestions. One of these organizations, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment has been in the forefront of those concerned about the quality of our urban programs.

NAHRO, as the organization is known on the Hill, and among professionals, is composed of local officials who are charged with successfully implementing our housing and renewal programs. It has been active at the Federal level in suggesting new programs, urging modifications in existing legislation, and, at times, opposing proposals which it feels would be detrimental to urban areas. Recently, the association held its 31st national conference in Portland, Oreg., where it adopted its policy resolutions for 1967-69. NAHRO was especially concerned about the civil disturbances that this country experienced this past summer, and saw them as indicators of the deep problems that afflict American urban life. It called for new attitudes to

deal with these problems. NAHRO expressed its frustration over the reaction to the magnitude of the urban problems. It called for a new sense of realism and a new commitment of enthusiasm and resources by those responsible for our urban programs. Specifically, to quote from the preamble of the policy resolutions:

NAHRO members are dismayed and frustrated over the lack of a sense of urgency in dealing with urban affairs; over inadequate funding of existing housing and community development programs; over insufficient flexibility in existing programs and the slowness with which requests for assistance are moved through the federal processing system; over the fact that a full measure of responsibility and initiative in existing programs is not vested in local agencies.

Mr. President, these complaints, voiced by those who administer our housing programs, should be viewed as a call for action on our part. We can excuse ourselves at times for passing inadequate legislation because we are not experienced in the administration of these programs. However, when the administrators take us to task, we have the responsibility to reexamine our policies and make those changes which are necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of recommendations offered by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials be placed in the RECORD at this point. These recommendations are deserving of our serious consideration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1967-69 POLICY RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS, ADOPTED AT THE 31ST NATIONAL CONFERENCE, PORTLAND, OREG., OCTOBER 10, 1967

PREAMBLE

The urban situation in the United States is one of uncertainty and unrest. Disturbances in major American cities in the summer of 1967 were surface indicators of the deep problems that afflict American urban life. Some of the root causes of the problems can be found in the evolution of the country into an urban nation and in efforts to adapt traditional solutions to meet changing needs.

Nowhere can the tension over solutions to urban problems be observed more closely than in the experience of housing and urban development programs over the last few years. Because these existing programs have not succeeded in stemming the tide of blight and unrest in urban areas, they have been labeled by some critics as failures and as the wrong approaches. This criticism must be seen as reflecting not only second-guessing but also a very shallow conclusion. If some programs have lacked major impact, it can be traced in large part to the failure to fund them at levels adequate to permit them to realize their full potential; to the failure to provide for a flexibility of administration that would allow them to adapt to the shifting and varying needs of local communities; and to the failure to recognize that single-purpose programs were not designed to treat total urban problems.

The members of NAHRO, assembled in their 31st national conference, would like to express constructively, and very emphatically, their conviction that more must be done to enable existing housing and community development programs to meet critical urban

needs. NAHRO members are dismayed and frustrated over the lack of a sense of urgency in dealing with urban affairs; over inadequate funding of existing housing and community development programs; over insufficient flexibility in existing programs and the slowness with which requests for assistance are moved through the federal processing system; over the fact that a full measure of responsibility and initiative in existing programs is not vested in local agencies.

Further, NAHRO believes that it is time for complete candor in urban affairs. Never before have the problems of urban areas had such concentrated attention in the public statements and discussions of important officials in both the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. Frustration and despair result when high-level attention does not result in action, in financed authorizations and appropriations. Frustration is generated when new program ideas are advocated as major "solutions" to urban problems when, in fact, they represent either untested theories or, even if workable, can be foreseen as exerting only a limited impact on the total need. There is a distinction between the goals we seek and a realistic appraisal of what actually can be achieved. There has been too much "action by press release" at every level of government.

There is need for a new sense of realism in urban affairs and a new commitment of enthusiasm and resources by all those charged with responsibility for urban programs. Only such a new outlook can sweep aside frustrations and inadequacies and provide a setting for future progress in meeting difficult urban problems.

1. Comprehensive programs and strategies

A complicated tangle of urban issues revolve around the so-called "poverty areas" in central cities and the sprawl of population and economic growth that is occurring in total metropolitan areas. Single-purpose improvement programs, such as urban renewal or public housing, are not geared to handle total urban problems. These problems are complex and demand complex solutions. Comprehensive program strategies are needed that combine physical, social and economic improvement efforts under a coordinated direction.

A comprehensive strategy for the renewal of *deprived neighborhoods in central cities* can be tested in the "model cities" program. A myriad of physical-economic-social activities can be combined in a coordinated effort to achieve a major impact. A total program strategy to guide the *growth and development of metropolitan areas* has not yet emerged. Present programs in metropolitan development consists largely of assistance to prepare land-use plans, to develop transportation systems, and to construct such basic public facilities as water and sewer systems. The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 authorized some new steps in this direction—incentives in additional funds to encourage a locality to develop basic facilities in coordination with a metropolitan plan and a new mortgage insurance program to assist in the assembly of land for development of new communities. But these new programs constitute only small pieces of what must go into a total metropolitan program strategy. Further, the gulf between the efforts to renew central cities and to guide the orderly development of metropolitan areas is rapidly evaporating. It will not be long before these two program efforts will not be able to proceed independently of each other. The next few years should witness a further pulling together of the major elements that can be shaped into a comprehensive program strategy covering both central cities and metropolitan areas.

Beyond a central city-metropolitan area program strategy lies a still less-explored ur-

ban frontier requiring exploration, covering such concerns as achieving an appropriate distribution of population and economic activity between urban and rural areas, programming the use of national resources, and considering the decentralization of some federal government activity to a regional and local basis. A *total urban strategy* requires long-range plans for meeting the urbanization problem on a national scale, covering perhaps the next 30 years.

2. Definition of goals for urban life

Progress towards meeting urban problems not only requires comprehensive program strategies but a re-evaluation of many of the traditional social philosophies and governmental processes that have dominated the American system since the beginning of the nation. It has been observed that our sophisticated technology is now capable of providing a wide range of living opportunities, which is the major virtue and appeal of urban life, but that our attitudes, our social structures—and the political machinery that reflects these attitudes and structures—are evolving with agonizing slowness.

In its 1965-67 policy resolution, NAHRO pointed to the lack of agreement as to what urban life should be and the need to develop an embracing philosophy of a new urban social structure in which the values associated with home and children, community life and friends, living and cooperating with nature, would have a chance to develop.

Reaching this agreement is still a most urgent task: we must set goals for urban life that will enrich the lives of all citizens, cover all aspects of environment, and help every citizen achieve independence and self-sufficiency. These goals should have the understanding and acceptance of a majority of the American people. It is only in the framework of such an understanding that we can answer the further question: can we organize our institutions and our resources to improve the quality of life for all Americans in a complex and rapidly-changing society?

To develop such agreement on goals for urban life requires adjustment of some traditional attitudes and practices which are constraints upon urban progress. They include:

The questionable ethic that anyone can lift himself into independence and self-sufficiency, without a national understanding of the environment of despair that we have permitted to exist in some of our deprived areas;

The growing trend toward federal government control over other levels of government, thus eroding the distinctive federal system of government written into our constitution, under which powers were reserved for non-federal jurisdictions;

The autonomy of very small units of government, without reference to their relationship to larger metropolitan and regional goals;

The practice of using planning and zoning requirements to stratify living patterns, without reference to the need to provide opportunities for low- and moderate-income families to find their places in the whole society;

The special privileges given highways and the automobile to operate without reference to their impact on the quality of urban development;

A traditional view of taxation as a limited, revenue-producing vehicle, without reference to how it might be used to achieve public policy goals;

A tendency to leave the development of land completely to the free play of market forces, without any reference to the need to protect natural resources and open space, and to guide an orderly development process;

A complacency growing out of the belief that a highly restricted commitment of the nation's resources can be made toward the solution of urban problems and that everything, given time, will turn out all right.

3. Creation of compatible conditions to assure urban progress

As the nation strives to bring some measure of order to urban life and seeks new approaches to pressing problems, NAHRO sees certain critical areas that require prompt attention. Action in these areas is an essential condition for urban progress.

Massing manpower for housing and urban development programs:

NAHRO reaffirms and reinforces the section of its policy resolution for 1965-67 that called for an immediate large-scale training and manpower development program for the urban development professions and continues to support the elements of such a program as spelled out in the resolution.

Giving the citizen a voice and the tenant a role in housing and urban development:

NAHRO reaffirms and reinforces the statement on citizen organization structure in its 1965-67 policy resolution, which called for development of a technique that actually brings citizens into an important advisory capacity, without precipitating clashes and power struggles. It further pledges its resources to assist local housing authorities to work constructively with tenant associations to achieve a maximum opportunity for tenant participation and advancement. Increased attention should also be given to "self-help" housing and home ownership opportunities for lower-income families.

Guaranteeing an equal housing opportunity and an option in housing location for every citizen:

The nation is entering a new era in civil rights. NAHRO states its firm conviction that appropriate actions should be taken at every level of government to assure an equal opportunity for good housing in a suitable living environment for all Americans. It further states its support for all measures that will insure a choice of housing opportunities and options in housing locations, in order that each individual citizen can achieve a maximum level of economic and social fulfillment. Further, the Association believes that these goals should not be left to unplanned development but that specific actions and programs should be formulated, on a time schedule, to bring about their accomplishment.

Achieving a workable process to coordinate Federal-State-local efforts in housing and urban development:

NAHRO reaffirms the statement in its 1965-67 policy resolution that calls for special study and demonstration in the area of intergovernmental relations in the urban development field. It particularly cites the following areas for special study: a broader base for federal assistance than categorical grant programs, the use of taxation as a public policy tool in urban development, the role of the state in housing and community development, and the coordination of housing and community development functions at the local and metropolitan area level.

Relating an expanded role by private enterprise to public policy goals and the functions of public agencies:

NAHRO welcomes an increased contribution by private enterprise to the improvement of urban conditions and reaffirms the important relationships of private interests to public activity detailed in its 1965-67 policy resolution. It re-emphasizes the importance for private activity to move forward in harmony with public policy goals and with a recognition of the primary role of public agencies in guiding an orderly housing and urban development effort.

Putting science and technology to work on behalf of housing and urban development goals:

The advances made in the area of national defense through the use of scientific methods and advanced technology have not taken place to any extent in the housing and urban development field. NAHRO calls for a

full-scale research and demonstration effort to investigate new methods and techniques of housing and urban development, including the exploration of the feasibility of a systems approach to rebuilding our cities.

PRIORITY ACTION AREAS FOR 1967-69

The nation is in mid-stream in the evolution of its urban programs and policies. The task is to move ahead with tested housing and urban development programs on an expanded scale—and, at the same time, to fold these programs into a broader and more comprehensive urban program strategy. Concurrent steps should be taken to define and to implement the broader strategy. NAHRO sees these priority action areas for the next two years.

Preparing for future urban development

Developing a central city—Metropolitan area program strategy:

NAHRO believes that there is an urgent and growing need for dealing with urban housing and renewal problems within the context of total metropolitan growth. Local programs in many areas need to be expanding in scope so that slums, blight and substandard conditions in suburban and rural fringe areas can be treated in concert with central city programs. Relocation and the expansion of housing opportunities for low- and middle-income families need to be planned and executed on a metropolitan basis so that these families may share the advantages of newly-created environment and access to suburban employment opportunities. Greater concern must be shown in metropolitan planning for meeting these needs by dealing with such problems as taxation and restrictive practices and by laying physical plans for transportation, land use, and community facilities that are directly aimed at the goal of providing "a decent home in a suitable environment for every American family." The federal government, likewise, should make the national housing goal its chief criterion for granting assistance to metropolitan areas in the development of highways, mass transportation, open space, sewer and water, and other facilities.

Utilizing research to formulate goals for urban life and remove constraints to urban progress:

Reaching agreement on goals for urban life is so crucial to future urban progress that we can no longer leave the development of such goals to the unplanned play of forces at work on the urban scene. If we are to make progress in time to avoid further tragic mistakes—and if we are to achieve the broad-based public support necessary for success—a bold program of research and demonstration should be undertaken to plumb and test the important issues where national support and direction are needed. We should accelerate the determination of goals for urban life. This is a first order of business for urban research and demonstration.

Undertaking a long-range study of national urbanization policy:

To prepare for the development of a national policy on urbanization, NAHRO believes that a special commission should be established to direct a long-range study covering such concerns as national population distribution and the allocation of national resources. Such a commission might well include the best talent of private industry, the universities, public officials at all levels of government, and professionals in the housing and urban development field.

Making housing and urban development programs an integral part of the Federal budget and national economic policy:

NAHRO sees the need to plan now for the day when the fuller resources of this country can be directed toward its domestic needs, and particularly those needs in the housing and urban development field. Three actions are necessary immediately: (a) the estab-

lishment of a Congressional commission to recommend priorities of need in our domestic programs, with particular attention to urban program needs; (b) the consideration, at the highest economic planning levels of the federal government—perhaps the President's Council of Economic Advisors or the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress—as to how housing and urban development can become an integral part of national economic planning; (c) the building a shelf of housing and urban development activities, ready to go, so that there will be no time lost when a shift can be made from a defense to a domestic economy.

Setting annual goals for housing production:

The production of housing for low- and moderate-income families has reached a critical juncture. Despite the overwhelming evidence of need production of new housing for these families has proceeded at an extremely slow pace. To begin the process of a firmer national commitment to the housing needs of the nation, NAHRO proposes that the Congress adopt goals for national housing production at the rate of 2 million units a year for the next 20 years and that 500,000 units of this total production be established for low- and moderate-income housing. To expedite these goals, Congress should request that the annual economic report of the President include a progress statement on what was done during the past year to achieve approved housing goals and what can be expected during the next year, under projected national economic policy. Further, it is proposed that the Congress request a special annual report from the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in conjunction with the annual economic report, which will indicate how proposed housing goals are to be implemented in the federal budget for the coming fiscal year. Since public housing continues to be the most viable method for bringing housing assistance to low-income families, at least half of any earmarking of annual units for low- and moderate-income housing should be reserved for an expansion of the public housing program.

Meeting current program needs

Adopting an interim improvement program to meet critical needs in areas designated for future urban renewal:

In 1967, the housing and urban development action that clearly combines the most urgent need and the largest element of national agreement is the improvement of living conditions in the most deprived neighborhoods in central cities. Comprehensive urban renewal treatment, or the more lasting actions inherent in the model cities program, cannot be effective for a number of years in most of these areas. An interim program to serve as a holding action, providing assistance to achieve minimum housing conditions and basic city services, should be adopted by the Congress as the first stage of a continuing renewal process.

Accelerating the decentralization of the Department of Housing and Urban Development:

Action to decentralize HUD to accommodate more decision-making at the regional level has not moved fast enough. Placement of more responsibility and initiative at the local level, particularly for experienced local agencies, has not occurred. Efforts to streamline processing of assistance, to provide needed technical guidance to localities, and to move programs through pipelines to completion have not been top priorities. NAHRO sees an immediate need to make the following objectives the first order of business: (a) the actual decentralization of the decision-making powers on operating programs to the regional administrator and his staff; (b) the streamlining of the assistance process in operating programs so that the assist-

ance programs can be moved; (c) the granting to local community agencies of a full measure of initiative and responsibility, in accordance with the declaration of policy in the Housing Act of 1959.

Testing new methods for assisting lower-income housing:

There are a growing number of techniques being tested as methods to achieve maximum production of lower-income housing: the public housing program (including its new approaches, such as turnkey and leasing of private housing); the direct loan program for elderly housing; the below-market interest rate program of the Federal Housing Administration under Section 221-d-3, plus the FHA 221-d-3 market-interest rate program with rent supplements. There are also new home ownership programs for lower-income families. In addition, there are a number of active demonstration plans and other proposals under consideration for adoption. NAHRO restates the need expressed in its 1965-67 policy resolution to give special attention to methods of meeting the housing needs of the large family and the very low-income family, including the family receiving welfare assistance and living in poor housing.

In order to make this period of testing most meaningful, NAHRO suggests some guidelines—and some cautions. Every effort should be made: (a) to amend the legislative and administrative requirements of existing programs in order to achieve maximum flexibility in adjusting to current conditions and needs; (b) to insure that the quality of both design and construction is conducive to the achievement of the social goals inherent in low-income housing programs; and (c) to provide objective measures for judging the achievements of each of the assistance techniques, including both economic and social criteria.

Maintaining the pace of urban renewal and re-casting it as a total development program:

The urban renewal program has now passed the evolutionary stage and has proven its basic workability. Many urban renewal projects are being completed and their influence is beginning to be felt in many communities. At the same time, requests for urban renewal assistance continue to increase. Not only are communities already in the program undertaking additional activity, but new communities of all sizes are undertaking their first urban renewal action. Recent surveys indicate that the demand for urban renewal funds will remain at about two and a half times the supply through fiscal 1969. It is vital that this pace of activity be maintained and that communities have the financial support necessary to carry out plans already under way.

The techniques of the urban renewal process have been proven to be sound and workable. Many of these techniques can be applied on a broader scale—both in central cities and on a metropolitan area basis. NAHRO recommends that a major effort be made over the next two years to recast urban renewal as a total process for the physical improvement of the city, not confined to "project areas," but related to the execution of a total community development plan. Urban renewal will be the cornerstone of the "model cities" effort and this experience should be used as a basis to move it from a "project" to a total community improvement effort. Such a recasting should be moved forward under an incentives system, with a shift to the new approach not made mandatory at the present time.

Stepping up actions to preserve, basically sound neighborhoods:

More attention should be given to the preservation of neighborhoods that require immediate attention to prevent them from falling into still further decline. This is basically the task of housing code enforcement programs, together with provision of basic city services and other capital improvements. The

concentrated codes program (Section 117), adopted by the Congress in 1965 as a major vehicle to arrest the decline of areas that are basically sound, should be expanded as rapidly as possible.

Giving flexibility to existing programs:

The experience of 30 years should not be cast aside in favor of wholly new and untried measures. Fundamental parts of successful housing and urban development programs are already on the statute books. They need to be strengthened.

NAHRO calls on the Department of Housing and Urban Development to review current administrative practices and regulations with a view to promoting flexibility in its assistance programs. Particularly, NAHRO sees a special need for a basic up-dating of the administrative organization and processes of the public housing program and a complete rethinking of the workable program and experience with it to date.

NAHRO also asks the Congress to approve needed legislative amendments that will make all housing and urban development programs flexible in meeting new needs. The Association presented a full report on needed legislative amendments in its 1967 testimony to the Congress; it will be making additional recommendations. Key legislative considerations include:

For the public housing program: write-down of site costs outside urban renewal areas; funding of a socially-oriented management function and of social services; annual contributions to modernize and update older housing developments; amendments to make possible a true opportunity for home ownership by public housing tenants.

For the urban renewal program: amendments to change the program from a "project" approach to a total development process; consideration of a 90 percent contribution formula and elimination of local credits; change in the local matching requirement for the urban beautification program to make it uniform with that of the open space program; separation of moving expenses and property losses in business relocation claims.

For the concentrated codes enforcement program: clarification of standards; broadening the types of improvements eligible as project costs; authorization of the acquisition and demolition of nonconforming uses; authorization to use the three-fourths matching grant in area redevelopment areas.

For demonstration programs: a more realistic funding of demonstration programs by removal of the two-thirds limitation on demonstration grants and making grants available to nonprofit institutions.

For the Section 202 and FHA 221-d-3 below-market interest rate programs: financial assistance to nonprofit sponsors to enable them to organize and develop projects; clarification of the conflicting provisions in these programs relating to organization and planning fees; payment for equipment, office, and community space; working capital; training; and workable program certification.

For the rent supplement program: authorization to use 50 percent of authorized funds in connection with below-market interest rate programs; reduction of the rent-income ratio from 25 to 20 percent; review of the unit construction cost limits.

Making relocation a centralized local operation and providing increased services: NAHRO continues to be concerned about providing the best possible relocation service to all persons and businesses displaced by governmental action. Although advances made in this area are promising—the establishment of central relocation services in many cities and the efforts to provide uniform relocation benefits—there is a continuing need for expanding relocation services.

It should be required that all governmental programs that displace households and businesses take on the additional responsibility of helping obtain relocation re-

sources and that such assistance be under plans consistent with urban renewal and housing policies.

In the area of residential relocation, while the primary aim is to assist displaced persons in gaining access to decent, safe, and sanitary housing at rents or prices within their means, many families must also be assisted with services relating to education, employment, homemaking, and family adjustment.

In the area of business relocation, while the primary aim is to assist the displacee to find a new location for his business, there is also a need to include guidance and assistance on management policies and practices that will better insure his future economic success.

A program of expanded relocation services, including special services for displaced families and businesses, as well as training for relocation personnel, should be given priority attention.

THE 1967-69 PROGRAM POLICY/RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman: Ira S. Robbins, Vice-Chairman New York City Housing Authority, New York, New York.

Melvin J. Adams, Executive Director, New Haven Redevelopment Agency, New Haven, Connecticut.

J. Ray Adams, Deputy Executive Director Seattle Housing Authority, Seattle, Washington.

Frederick T. Aschman, Executive Vice-President, Martin-Aschman Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Ellis Ash, Administrator, Boston Housing Authority, Boston, Massachusetts.

Thomas R. Bodine, Commissioner, Housing Authority of the City of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticut.

Richard F. Cahill, State Urban Renewal Director, Department of Economic Development, Augusta, Maine.

Napoleon Britt, Chairman, The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Richmond, Richmond, California.

Gordon Cavanaugh, Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Cushing Dolbeare, Executive Director, The Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Allan B. Elliot, Assistant Executive Director, D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency, Washington, D.C.

Karl L. Falk, Chairman, Housing Authority of the City of Fresno, Fresno, California.

Charles L. Farris, President, Urban Programming Corporation of America, St. Louis, Missouri.

T. Scott Fillebrown, Jr., Chairman, Nashville Housing Authority, Nashville, Tennessee.

Daniel Finn, Commissioner, Housing Inspection Department, Boston, Massachusetts.

Irby Giddens, Director of Development, Miami Housing Authority, Miami, Florida.

Mark K. Herley, Assistant Director, Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Michigan.

Lewis W. Hill, Commissioner, Department of Urban Renewal, Chicago, Illinois.

Edward L. Holmgren, Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, Chicago, Illinois.

LeRoy Jones, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Community Affairs, Hartford, Connecticut.

Robert T. Jorvig, City Coordinator, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Robert D. Knox, Director, Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Michigan.

George D. Millar, Jr., Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Little Rock, Little Rock, Arkansas.

Gordon Manser, Associate Director, National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., New York, New York.

William L. Rafsky, Executive Vice-President, Old Philadelphia Development Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Chester Rapkin, Professor of Urban Planning, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Vernon L. Sawyer, Executive Director, Redevelopment Commission of the City of Charlotte, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Walter M. Simmons, Executive Director, Memphis Housing Authority, Memphis, Tennessee.

Guy M. Tate, Director, Bureau of Sanitation, Birmingham, Alabama.

Oliver C. Winston, Director, Office Regional Resources and Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

NAHRO Staff: Mary K. Nenno, Associate Director for Program Policy and Research.

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, 11 years ago this week, the courageous people of Hungary made a valiant attempt to cast off the shackles of Soviet imperialism and reestablish the independence which was theirs before they were "liberated" by the Red armies in World War II.

The revolution at first succeeded, and then it failed. Bodies and stones were no match for tanks and cannon. The cost of the revolution to the Soviets was high, even though they crushed it. The cost to the Hungarians who were the revolution was, of course, much higher.

There are today in Hungary unknown thousands of political prisoners, most of them from the revolution. Hundreds—perhaps thousands—more have been executed.

Although some reforms followed the revolution, Hungary is still very much a captive nation—a colonial entity, governed in the cruelest and most rapacious fashion by the same powers who have the audacity to stand in the U.N. forum in New York and assail America for alleged "neocolonialism."

The only colonial power of any consequence left in the world today is Russia. But this is not discussed in U.N. circles.

A friend of mine visited Budapest in September of this year. He reported that:

Budapest is an unhappy island of the averted glance, the hushed conversation, and the obvious austerity imposed by a foreign political and ideological system which has no room for economic pragmatism, political freedom, or national independence.

The contrast between political systems—Communism and Capitalism—is never so patent as when one travels in a single day from the happiness, prosperity and purpose of West Berlin to the smothering unhappiness of Budapest, where the hammer and sickle festoons the boulevards, and the red star of Moscow adorns the buildings. You can just as readily be shot in attempting to flee from Hungary or Czechoslovakia to Austria as from East Berlin to the west.

History may record the failure of the United States and the free world to act in 1956 as the greatest lost opportunity of mankind.

The rapid imprisonment of political activists in Poland at the outbreak of fighting in Budapest was graphic evidence of fears in the Kremlin that the affinity of these two Catholic countries would ignite a two-headed revolution with which Russia could not cope.

The rapid, brutal movement of Russian police and troops in that October, 11 years ago, prevented the igniting of the spark in Poland.

Much has been written of the Hungarian revolution. On this 11th anniversary, a new book, "The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective," edited by Francis S. Wagner, is valuable reading. I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks, a commentary on the book carried in the October 23 Hungarian Freedom Fighter publication, be printed in the RECORD. I ask also that a commentary, "The Reality Gap in Eastern Europe," by Newsweek's F. Yorick Blumenfeld, be printed.

Mr. President, the people of Hungary proved in 1956 that in the final analysis, a soldier's pack bears down upon the shoulders of a nation less oppressively than do the chains of a prisoner.

Hungarians were defeated in their short-lived revolution not because they were wrong, nor because they lacked national support, but, despite the rightness of their cause, because they lacked the pure force of arms to defeat the foreign army sent to crush them.

Speaking on the fifth anniversary of the revolution in 1961, the late Albert Camus said of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters:

If their distress is ours, hope is ours also. In spite of their misery, their chains, their exile, they have left us a glorious heritage which we must deserve: freedom, which they not only chose, but which in one single day, they gave back to us.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HUNGARIAN REVOLT IN PERSPECTIVE

A great deal has been written about the Hungarian revolution. However, most of this has been merely descriptive or evocative and very little has been devoted to the analysis of the revolution as a historical phenomenon. *The Hungarian Revolution in Perspective*, a book edited by Francis S. Wagner and published through the efforts of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Fed. Inc., by The Freedom Fighters Memorial Foundation, is an important contribution to filling that void.

The book begins with a collection of quotations which evoke the various moods and spontaneous reactions to the 1956 freedom fight. They include the eloquence of Pope Pius, the dismay of a Nigerian student that such "imperialism" could still exist in Central Europe, the prophecy of Milovan Djilas that the revolution marked "the beginning of the end of Communism," and the reproach of Pablo Picasso to the French Communists for failing to face the issue unambiguously.

In the second section of the book somewhat longer "reflections" of a handful of people eloquently restate the commitment to which the Hungarian fight for freedom calls the free world. There are contributions from Richard M. Nixon, Senator Claiborne Pell, Otto von Habsburg, and Thomas Molnar.

In an essay, Dr. Wagner has addressed himself to the thinking of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Using a number of unpublished sources from the Dulles Papers housed at the Princeton University Library, Dr. Wagner has indicated enough to show that the thinking and role of the Secretary of State should be the subject of an exhaustive study of its own. Another question which Dr. Wagner points to is the correlation of the Freedom Fight and of the Suez crisis.

The main portion of the book contains a

number of original studies on several aspects of the freedom fight. Salvador de Madariaga puts it in the broader perspective of the philosophy of history and of the history of human efforts to become free. This great European statesman-philosopher's writings on Hungary have become legendary.

A longer study by Professor Gogolak is devoted to the sociology and ideology of the Hungarian regime against which the people of Hungary revolted in 1956.

In an essay the role of Communist China in the Hungarian revolution, David Hongtoh Bau gives an example of the deep repercussions of the revolt within the communist empire and traces the relationship of the revolt to the emergence of China as an independent communist state. In a well-documented study of the economic causes of the Hungarian revolt, George Kopits argues that the indirect factor of the soviet exploitation of Hungarian uranium deposits was a more important factor in launching the revolt than the direct factors of low standards of living, unavailability of basic consumer goods and the intensive socialization of the economy.

The book also contains an excerpt from the Congressional Record in which former Congressman Alvin M. Bentley, a strong supporter of the Hungarian cause and frequent critic of administration policies, debated the Hungarian issue.

The book closes with an extremely valuable bibliography, compiled by Dr. I. L. Halasz de Beky. Containing more than 1200 titles among them several in a dozen different languages, the bibliography will stimulate further research into the subject.

THE REALITY GAP IN EASTERN EUROPE

(By F. Yorick Blumenfeld)

(NOTE.—In recent years, the notion that the Communist states of Eastern Europe are making great strides toward liberalization has become part of the conventional wisdom of Western statesmen and journalists. But is it true? From his firsthand knowledge of the area, the man who was Newsweek's Eastern European correspondent from 1964 until August of this year challenges that view.)

Three years of reporting from the colorless, soot-covered capitals of Eastern Europe—so unlike what Americans see in travel brochures—have convinced me that the most serious problem facing the leadership of the Communist states today is the "reality gap." The continuing predicament of such Communist dictators as Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka, Hungary's Janos Kadar, Czechoslovakia's Antonin Novotny, or Bulgaria's Todor Zhivkov (all of whom have maintained their undisputed grip on power since 1956) is how to grapple with actuality. The failure to make talk correspond to action and propaganda to reality flaws every aspect of so-called socialist life—from the halfhearted efforts at economic reform, which are accompanied by a universal refusal to close down unprofitable factories, to the irresolute attempts to keep alive the discredited notion of socialist realism in the arts.

The resulting atmosphere of fantasy, of unreality bordering on the absurd, distorts a wide range of issues. Some cases in point:

Recently, while I was lunching with two Rumanian literary editors in Bucharest, one of them earnestly asked me if it was true that America was helping Red China with its nuclear-weapons program. When I asked how he had come by such a startling idea, he answered: "I'm not sure, but I think it was broadcast by Radio Moscow." And, indeed, on checking back, I found that not only had the U.S. been accused of delivering atomic equipment to China, but that, according to Radio Moscow, Peking and Washington had even reached a "mutual understanding" on the Vietnamese war. Black propaganda? No. Most European Communists

are paranoid on the subject of possible Sino-American collusion.

On my last swing through Prague, Budapest and Belgrade, I heard self-assured, unflinching Foreign Ministry officials in each capital denounce Israel as a "willing tool of colonialism" and accuse the West Germany Army of having obtained an excellent "experimental range for its new weapons" in the Sinai Peninsula. Incredible? No. This is the official line in Eastern Europe.

In Belgrade, a usually rational senior official in the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry told an open-mouthed colleague and myself that the recent coup in Greece, the movements of the American Sixth Fleet in the Adriatic and the "sinister collusion" between Israel and the United States against Yugoslavia's friend Nasser were proof of a complex Western conspiracy against Yugoslavia's territorial integrity. Preposterous? To the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry the connection between these events seemed self-evident.

Sipping coffee with the editor of a Communist Party daily on the terrace of Budapest's Gellert Hotel, I asked him: "How much longer will Russian troops continue to be stationed in Hungary?" Without hesitation, he replied: "The Russians are here for our own protection, at the invitation of our government. This has nothing to do with our internal situation. Considering the increasing state of international tension, the further stay of these forces in Hungary is not only right but necessary." This was not a political fossil talking but a concerned man—who had swallowed the party line.

Discussing the problem of control over the arts in Prague with a lady bureaucrat from the Ministry of Culture, I was unsurprised, after numerous such encounters, to hear her blandly declare that "art for art's sake is self-deception." Primly and self-righteously, she then denounced individualism, artistic isolation and even apolitical attitudes. To hear her rant about the "degenerate, decadent artistic views of Western bourgeois circles" seemed like an embarrassing throwback to the era of Goebbels's National Socialism. Yet, this was official Prague, 1967.

One of the most insidious effects of such socialist verbiage is the fact that, eventually, Western journalists working in Eastern Europe come to accept it as the normal frame of reference. Together with the political sections of the Western embassies, the press begins to look for subtle variations in the public positions taken by party spokesmen—variations which may or may not be significant. Behind closed doors, or completely off the record, these same officials may occasionally take off their red contact lenses and make a tough, cold-blooded appraisal of a given situation. At a candlelight dinner party given by a French diplomat in Sofia last spring, a Bulgarian spokesman, whom I had come to regard as a dogmatist, presented me with a lucid assessment of America's involvement in Vietnam. He saw this not as "imperialist aggression" but as a "tragic case of escalation." American diplomats have, in fact, long become accustomed to hearing two entirely different records from their counterparts in the Communist countries.

As I now try to recall individual conversations with various officials, my memories are blurred by the flow of platitudes, the Kafkaesque vision of an endless series of musty rooms decorated with slightly moth-eaten, crimson velvet curtains, and the stench of stale tobacco and Lysol. Somehow, the anesthetized bureaucrats of Eastern Europe seemed incapable of recognizing the fact that a rise in industrial production does not axiomatically bring about the betterment of society. These *apparatchiki* seemed forever surprised when I refused to accept their statistics on the increase in the per capita output of steel, cement, or electricity as overwhelming proof that the quality of life itself was improving. One hundred years

after the publication of Marx's "Das Kapital," the Communist mentality has fallen prey to its own, self-propagated illusions.

NEW SOCIALIST MAN?

Fundamental to the mystique about the superiority of "the socialist system" is the notion that Marxism-Leninism is producing—or is about to produce—a new socialist man. Ideologists throughout Eastern Europe seem genuinely to believe that a new society will evolve with the disappearance of the class struggle and the improvement of the standard of living. But as the brilliant young Czech motion-picture director Ivan Passer tried to show in his film "Intimate Lighting," the truth is that socialism has solved none of the basic human dilemmas. In his humorous portrayal of a humdrum Sunday dinner in a suburban Prague household, Passer destroys the notion that twenty years of Communist dictatorship have revolutionized the Czech way of life. Such a message might seem banal to Americans, but to the Czech Communist leadership, it is anathema. Few shibboleths are held more sacred than the notion that the inevitable result of Communist power must be the flowering of a new and revolutionary kind of existence.

But the Communists are not alone in being deluded by their own wishful thinking and propaganda. Coming back to the United States, I have found that Americans consider Stalin solidly buried in Svetlana's memoirs—while in actual fact, some forms of the dogmatic system Stalin instituted continue to flourish in Eastern Europe. Little of what I now hear in America about Eastern Europe, in fact, truly relates to the realities of Warsaw, Prague or Budapest.

Even some very sophisticated American observers prefer not to think in such unfashionable terms as the "Iron Curtain," or "police states." Yet, merely wishing the curtain away because it may gradually be replaced by more sophisticated electronic devices does not alter the fact of its existence. Numbers of East Germans, Czechs and Hungarians are still being shot trying to cross into Austria. This is a reality which is now largely overlooked by those who hope that Communism is entering an era of liberalization. Communist regimes are, indeed, liberalizing—but at the pace of two steps forward and one and three-quarter steps back. While there is experimentation with social and economic reforms, change proceeds at a much slower pace in Eastern Europe than most Americans can even begin to imagine.

America's outlook on Yugoslavia furnishes an excellent example. For years, we had been accepting the cleverly formulated Yugoslav position of nonalignment, of a break with Moscow and of Tito's independent course in foreign policy. But it only took the Middle East crisis to show how frail these assumptions were. Tito's first move last June was to fly to Moscow and condemn Israeli-American aggression against the Arabs. Then, having signed a joint declaration with the other Communist leaders, he broke off diplomatic relations with Israel in an unprecedented and arbitrary manner. Later in the summer, in a determined effort to patch up his image in the West, Tito suddenly turned into a self-appointed emissary of peace in the Middle East. This curious conduct, however, hardly seems less logical than that of Western observers who still choose to believe that in a showdown, Yugoslavia will side with the West or remain neutral.

REALISM

Of all Eastern European nations, only Rumania has shown any degree of realism in recent months. Seemingly, Rumania's leaders have tried to follow a policy of noninterference in the affairs of other nations to its logical conclusions. The Rumanian outlook on the ineffectuality of the Eastern European Common Market, the superannuation of

the Warsaw Pact, and the built-in impotence of Communist summit conferences is gradually suggesting alternatives. Even such a staunch supporter of Moscow as Bulgaria's Todor Zhivkov, while still occasionally serving as the Eastern European spokesman for the Soviet Union, is aware that Rumania's insistence on mutually advantageous exchanges has more to offer than the unilateral dictation of terms from Russia. However, Rumania's voice is almost lost in the morass of Eastern European irrationality. The process of evaluating possibilities for independent thought and action evolves only gradually in that part of the world—and many years must still pass before realism will be found in any abundance among the Communist organizations from Tirana to Warsaw.

MAJORITY OF NATIONS OF THE WORLD CONSIDER HUMAN RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL CONCERN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on October 11 voted to report favorably one human rights convention—the Supplementary Slavery Convention. At the same time, the committee voted to table the Human Rights Conventions on Political Rights of Women and Forced Labor.

The tabling action by the committee not only struck a severe blow to the hopes of those people who have fought for U.S. ratification of all the human rights conventions, but also reduced U.S. participation in International Human Rights Year to almost a meaningless charade.

As we approach International Human Rights Year, I think it would be both interesting and revealing to list the nations which are parties to the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor and Political Rights of Women.

The parties to the Human Rights Convention on Political Rights of Women are: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Canada, Central Africa, China, Congo—Brazzaville, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Cuba, Iceland, India, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Mongolia, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Thailand and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, and Republic of Korea.

In addition, the Human Rights Convention on Forced Labor has the following nations as parties to it: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central Africa, Chad, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Cuba, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali Republic, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sweden, Syria, Tan-

zania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian S.S.R., United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia, Guyana, and Republic of Germany.

THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION SPOTLIGHT ON ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Chicago Crime Commission has recently released a booklet entitled "Spotlight on Organized Crime—The Chicago Syndicate." It is noteworthy in several respects. I believe it will contribute significantly to the increasing momentum at all levels of government and among individual citizens of the effort to rid our society of the burden of organized crime.

The executive director of the commission, Virgil W. Peterson, outlines in the report of the challenge posed by organized crime to communities which find themselves infested by the mob. Those of my colleagues who have joined in the effort to arouse the public to the dangers of the mob will find his message particularly appropriate:

[T]he successful prosecution of crime syndicate leaders, as highly important as that may be, is only one phase of the battle against organized crime. As long as citizens continue to patronize those activities which give the underworld wealth and power—gambling, vice, loan sharking—the battle against organized crime will never be won. When a citizen asks the usual question: "What are the authorities doing about organized crime?" he should be able to give a satisfactory answer to the query, "What am I doing about organized crime?"

As the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice pointed out, the basis for any successful effort to combat organized crime rests on an aroused citizenry. The Chicago Crime Commission report is unique, in my experience, in its response to the need to arouse and inform the public. The commission itself is a private-sector, nonpartisan, non-profit volunteer citizen group. The publication of the report is timed to coincide with Chicago Law Enforcement Week, October 29 through November 4.

The report outlines recent progress made in successful prosecutions of mobsters, an encouraging record for which much credit is due the investigative and prosecutorial authorities responsible. While commending them, I sincerely hope they will redouble their efforts and increase even more the pressure on the mob. It will not only benefit Chicago, but the Nation as well.

Mr. President, I know there are many Senators and Congressmen who will wish access to this unique report. Not only in form but in substance can it be of great utility to local crime commissions throughout the country, and to the general public as well. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the report be inserted in its entirety in the RECORD. I commend it to all who are concerned with the problem of organized crime in our society.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION SPOTLIGHT
ON ORGANIZED CRIME—THE CHICAGO SYNDI-
CATE**

**CHICAGO LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK OCTOBER 29
TO NOVEMBER 4, 1967**

The Third Annual Chicago Law Enforcement Week, sponsored by the Chicago Crime Commission, is devoted to spotlighting organized crime in Chicago. We wish to express our gratitude to the law enforcement agencies who are supporting this effort:

Chicago Police Department.
Sheriff of Cook County.
State's Attorney of Cook County.
Cook County Suburban Chiefs of Police.
Illinois Crime Investigating Commission.
United States Government: Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit, Bureau of Narcotics, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Service, Labor Department—Labor-Management and Welfare Pension Reports, Post Office Department, Secret Service, United States Attorney.

(Chicago Crime Commission, 79 W. Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603, Franklin 2-0101.)
(The Chicago Crime Commission is a non-partisan volunteer citizens organization founded in 1919 to fight crime in Greater Chicago. It is not supported by taxes, is not affiliated with any agency of government, nor is it financially supported by any of the civic or social agencies. The basic purpose of the Commission is to act as an independent investigative "watchdog" representative of the public interest.)

**THE CHICAGO CRIME COMMISSION SPOTLIGHT ON
ORGANIZED CRIME**

This booklet—the first of its kind—is being published by the Chicago Crime Commission so that the honest citizen who wants to see the blight of organized crime driven from Chicago will accept the challenge of doing his part.

Organized crime is, plainly, a cancerous growth on our community. As the President's Commission on Crime has stated, the most remarkable aspect of the syndicate is that the public has tolerated it for so long. If an aroused citizenry demands action, it will go. If an apathetic citizenry tolerates it, it will stay.

The Chicago Crime Commission is dedicated to the goal of describing for the citizens of Chicago the impact that organized crime has on this community and everyone who lives in it.

We first document the victories that have recently been won. In the last 30 months a significant number of these hoodlums have been successfully prosecuted. We do this to demonstrate to our community that these parasites can be placed behind bars. Then, we list persons associated with the syndicate. We recognize that this is only a beginning. There are many others, and the Chicago Crime Commission will turn its spotlight on them in the months to come. Next, we describe the danger signs that indicate the hoodlums are moving in on a community. Finally, we list some of the businesses with which the syndicate is connected, directly or indirectly, through ownership or association.

First, let us define the syndicate. Syndicate, mob, outfit, Cosa Nostra—call it what you will—has numerous definitions. The economist may call it an illegal cartel; the student of political science or law may refer to it as a government within a government. We prefer to call it a cancer on the body of the cities of our nation where it exists. Whether tightly or loosely organized, the important fact is that it exists.

We will use for the syndicate a working definition that should be acceptable to all students of organized crime: It is that association of hoodlums, gangsters, corrupted public officials, hangers-on and fellow travelers who operate in multifarious activities, legal and illegal, for the express purpose of

organized preying on the public. Its purposes are the gathering of immense profits and the power necessary to insure further profits without undue pressure from the authorities or legitimate competition. It is concerned not with the source of its profits—they may come from illegal or legal pursuits.

The syndicate does not consist only of the Accardos, Giancanas, Alderisios and Aluppas. It is a social cancer whose membership is comprised mostly of leeches, parasites and fellow travelers. It is the conviction of the Chicago Crime Commission that the spotlight must be placed on the lowest level contributor to the workings of organized crime as well as the leaders who are prominently in the press. The leaders can operate only so long as they are insulated by those who do the dirty work and those who connive with them.

SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTIONS OF GANGSTERS

Before detailing the composition of the syndicate in Chicago, we emphasize that in recent years significant accomplishments have been recorded in Chicago's courts in the fight against the membership and fellow travelers of the syndicate. The accomplishments clearly illustrate that the syndicate can be prosecuted successfully. The historic "immunity" these parasites have seemed to enjoy can be penetrated and society can protect itself against the social cancer we call organized crime. The formula for success has not been the application of unique methods but rather has been the fundamental system whereby the investigative agencies, the prosecutor's office and a willing public have worked long and hard in common effort.

While there have been many successful prosecutions, the sentences, unfortunately, have frequently not been commensurate with the crime and the criminal. Far too little public attention is paid to the sentencing of syndicate members who have been successfully prosecuted. In some cases, such as those involving refilling of liquor bottles, providing false information on federal retail liquor dealer applications and hijackings with unspectacular sums involved, the sentences do not reflect awareness of the organized crime connection of the defendants or their businesses. Sentences like a \$200 fine or an hour in the custody of the United States Marshal are not going to deter members of the syndicate. Neither will the imposition of a sentence to run concurrently with one earlier imposed, as occurred in a recent case involving a leading mobster.

Increased public attention to the sentencing of organized criminals is essential. The community, by its expressed interest, must do all that it can to demand sentences of sufficient impact to make career crime completely unprofitable.

The following convictions are a tribute to the dedicated investigators who uncovered the evidence, the conscientious prosecutors who persevered under ever tightening rules of evidence and procedures and especially to those few citizens who stepped forth to furnish the facts and testified as to the illegal activities that were the basis for these convictions.

The 1967 convictions

Anthony Menolascino, convicted of failure to pay federal wagering tax. Sentence: One year in prison.

Marshall Caifano, convicted of interstate fraud involving counterfeited stock certificates. Sentence: Twelve years in prison to run concurrently with the 10 year sentence he was already serving. (Caifano's co-defendants, John Fannon, Dominic Donato and Anthony Gallas were also found guilty and sentenced to three years and four years respectively.)

Albert Milstein, licensee of the Stop-Life Tavern, convicted of possessing refilled liquor bottles. Sentence: Six months in jail and a \$1,000 fine.

Ernest Infelice, Morris Saletko, Anthony Legato, Frank Gallo, Joseph Rossi, Thomas Daniel Bambulas, Emil Crovedi, Roy Nielson, Kenneth Bratko, John Anthony Borsellino, John Varella and Albert Cardenas, convicted of conspiracy to possess goods stolen from interstate commerce. Sentences: 10 to 20 years. (These amounted to what is believed to be the greatest number of significant syndicate defendants and total number of years in sentences resulting from one trial.)

Richard Hauff, convicted of an interstate fraud violation. Sentence: Three years on each of five counts to run consecutively with a sentence imposed in 1966.

Sam Battaglia, Joseph Amabile and Dave Evans, convicted of conspiracy to commit extortion affecting interstate commerce. Sentences: Battaglia and Amabile, 15 years; Evans, 10 years.

William Messino, Joseph Lombardi, Jr., George Bravos and Sam Mecurio, convicted of aggravated kidnapping and related charges. Sentences: Messino, 10-30 years; Lombardi, 20 years; Bravos and Mecurio, 5-20 years.

Frank Parrillo, convicted of possession of refilled liquor bottles.

Joseph Iatarolo, George Victor Nasse, Orland David, Robert David and Herman David, convicted for auto theft conspiracy. Sentences: 3 to 5 years.

Pasquale Accettura, convicted of interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle. Sentence: 5 years.

Rocco Potenza, convicted of failure to pay the retail liquor dealers' special tax. Sentence: \$1,000 fine.

Anthony Rocco Silvestri, convicted on a charge of interstate transportation of stolen property. Sentence: 6 months in custody and 3½ years on probation.

James Vercillo and Frank J. Falbo, convicted for violations of the wagering tax laws. Sentence: 6 months in jail and 3 years probation.

John Fezekas, and Eugene Izzi, convicted on charges of interstate travel in aid of racketeering. Sentences: Fezekas, probation; Izzi, 3 years in custody of Attorney General.

The 1966 convictions

Hunter W. Hinson, Louis H. Sullivan and Doyle McGuire, convicted of interstate travel in aid of racketeering. Sentences: Initially, 5 years but later reduced to 90 days.

Sheldon Teller and John D. Sullivan, convicted for violation of the Federal narcotics laws. Sentences: Teller, 18 years; Sullivan, 9 years.

Richard W. Hauff and Arthur N. Nasser, convicted of conspiracy in U.S. District Court. Sentences: 3 years.

Ernest Sansone, convicted of failing to register with Customs authorities before leaving the United States for Mexico. Sentence: 1 year.

Richard E. Gorman, convicted on charges of violations of the Internal Revenue code. Sentence: 3 years.

Anthony Magglo, charged with violation of a previous probation. Sentence: 1 year.

Vincent (the Saint) Inzerro, convicted for failure to file income tax returns. Sentence: 2 years plus probation.

Leo Rugendorf and Larry Rosenberg, convicted for violation of the bankruptcy laws and interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicle laws. Sentences: 5 years in the custody of the Attorney General.

Josephine Pawlak, Charles Ross and Bernard Mayes, convicted of arson. Sentences: Pawlak, 2 to 8 years; Ross, 2 to 6 years; Mayes, 3 years probation.

Benjamin R. Stein, convicted on charges of making illegal gifts to union officials in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Sentence: 18 months.

Anthony R. Pinell, convicted of violating the Internal Revenue statutes. Sentence: probation 2 years, \$2,000 fine.

Robert J. McDonnell, Ernest (Rocky) In-

felice, Joseph (Cowboy) Mirro, Frank Santucci and Americo de Pietto, convicted on charges of conspiracy to transport stolen money orders in interstate commerce. Sentences: 5 years.

Rocco Pranno, Wayne Seidler and Peter Anderson, convicted for extortion and conspiracy. Sentences: Pranno, 15 years; Seidler, 5 years; Anderson, 3 years.

Jasper Campisi and Tony Cirignani were held in contempt of court and committed to Cook County Jail following their appearance before a Cook County grand jury where both men hid behind the Fifth Amendment.

Albert Roviario, convicted on narcotics charge. Sentence: 10 years.

Pat Manno, Robert Wolcuff, Sanford Burton Wolcuff, John Lo Russo and Larry Freedman, convicted of violation of the bankruptcy act.

Murray Humphreys, indicted for perjury in his testimony before a Federal grand jury. Humphreys died before this indictment was prosecuted.

William Monaco and Robert Armidano were convicted for possessing a black powder bomb. Sentences: Monaco, 2 to 5 years; Armidano, 6 months jail and 4½ years probation.

Sam de Stefano convicted on a charge of conspiracy to commit perjury. Sentence: 3 to 5 years.

Joseph Jack Polito and Leo Enrico Casale, convicted for violations of a new Federal statute pertaining to sports bribery.

Felix (Milwaukee Phil) Alderisio, convicted for violation of the Federal extortion statute. Sentence: 4½ years.

Samuel Giancana, was sentenced to jail for contempt of the Federal grand jury. Served 1 year.

Willie Eugene Engram, convicted for violation of the Federal firearms act. Sentence: 5 years in custody of Attorney General.

Anthony Genna and Joseph Sarillo, convicted for battery and intimidation. Sentences: 6 months.

Also convicted during the past several years in various cases charging mail fraud, conspiracy, or bankruptcy fraud were Vincent Edward Winel, Morton Schulman, Allan Solomon, Alex Apuzzo, Al Hara, Robert Berk, Angelo Ferrara, Ronald Hamu, James E. Corcoran, Martin J. Santa, Joe Smith and George Dasho.

On February 24, 1966 the Cook County Criminal Court upheld the law creating the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission and that Commission's power to subpoena witnesses. The direct consequence of this ruling was that the following alleged juice racket gangsters will have to attend hearings before the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission when recalled or be in contempt of the Cook County Criminal Court: Fiore Buccieri, Frank Buccieri, Joseph Grieco, Chris Cardl, Dominic Carzulo, Joseph Gagliano, Peter Ori, Lenny Patrick and Anthony Spilotro.

During 1966, 224 convictions were obtained against defendants named in gambling indictments from Cook County. Pending in the Cook County courts are 130 wire room cases growing out of arrests made by the police.

In addition to its investigative work on many of the above cases, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been a major contributor to the program aimed at the gambling fraternity. During the past 4 years, over 140 raids have been conducted based on information supplied by the FBI. These raids have resulted in over 369 convictions, confiscation or destruction of one-half million dollars in gambling paraphernalia and over \$150,000 in U.S. currency confiscated.

THE CHICAGO SYNDICATE

An evaluation of the Chicago syndicate requires an effort at defining the upper echelon that really is the controlling force. In this upper echelon the Chicago Crime

Commission includes the following names: Anthony Joseph Accardo, Gus Alex, Sam Battaglia, Fiore Buccieri, Jack P. Cerone, William Daddano, Sr., Paul "The Waiter" Ricca—DeLucia, Joseph DiVarco, Sam Giancana, Frank LaPorte, Ralph Pierce, Ross Prio, Edward Vogel.

Members of the Chicago crime syndicate draw their strength from loosely defined geographical areas of operation. While there is a continual shifting of boundaries and overlapping of areas of interest, the following are the major geographical areas of influence:

Chicago Loop—Gus Alex.

Chicago Near North Side—Joseph DiVarco, Joseph Arnold.

Chicago Far North and Northwest Suburbs—Leonard Patrick, Ross Prio.

Chicago Far West and West Suburbs—Sam Battaglia, William Daddano, Sam Giancana.

Chicago Southside—Ralph Pierce.

Chicago South and Southwest Suburbs—Frank LaPorte, Fiore Buccieri.

We have already defined the syndicate in Chicago as being a loose amalgamation ranging from the tightly knit hoodlums at the top down to the petty criminals who contribute so materially to its existence. There follows a group of persons who deserve to be identified with the syndicate because of their activities in recent years. They have one common tie—a contribution either direct or indirect to furthering the purposes of the syndicate. Some are clearly members of the Chicago crime syndicate, others are fellow travelers and still others are dupes of the "oufit." Many are the pawns that do the bidding of the mob, who break the laws and take the risks, all to insulate "Mr. Big" and his lieutenants from the courts.

(NOTE.—This list with ages and last known addresses does not purport to be all inclusive. Many names under indictment or investigation have of necessity been omitted.)

Able, Edward, 59, 6749 S. Laffin.

Accardo, Anthony Joseph, 61, 1407 N. Ashland Ave., River Forest.

Acetura, Pasquale, 38, 6137 S. Massasoit.

Aluppa, Joseph, 60, 4 Yorkshire Drive, Elmhurst.

Alderisio, Felix (Phil), 56, 505 Berkeley, Riverside.

Alex, Gus, 53, 1150 North Lake Shore Drive.

Allegretti, James, 63, U.S. Penitentiary, Terre Haute.

Aloisio, William "Smokes", 60, 2434 North Lorel.

Altieri, Joseph, 33, 1543 W. Grenshaw.

Amabile, Joseph "Joe Shine", 51, 4N474 Linda Lane, Addison.

Anderson, Nelson, 51, 6242 S. Normal.

Anderson, Peter, 68, 1719 N. Mannheim Road, Stone Park.

Anglini, Donald, 41, 812 Euclid, Elmhurst.

Annoreno, Steve, 35, 938 Jackson, River Forest.

Arlotta, Joseph, 44, 721 Seward, Evanston.

Armidano, Robert, 26, 4715 W. Monroe Street.

Arnold, Joseph, 55, 2724 W. Winnemac.

Aureli, Frank A., 47, 5501 W. Washington.

Bacino, Phil, 65, 14 163rd St., Calumet City.

Bakes, Ned Charles, 63, 900 Lake Shore Drive.

Bacarella, Michael, 40, 1210 N. Parkside.

Bactus, Joseph, 7607 Sheridan.

Bastone, Carmen, 36, 7207 Breen, Niles.

Batiste, Laurence, 118 E. 55th Street.

Battaglia, Sam, 62, 1114 N. Ridgeland, Oak Park.

Blasi, Dominick, 56, 1138 Park Ave., River Forest.

Brancatto, Dominick, 61, 1629 Sherwin.

Bravos, George, 54, 715 N. Pulaski.

Bravos, Nick, 53, 8831 Kathy Lane, Des Plaines.

Brattia, Louis, 59, 1074 Polk Street.

Bruscato, Frank, 39, 2417 Bryn Mawr.

Buccieri, Fiore, 62, 3004 S. Maple, Berwyn.

Buccieri, Frank, 48, 2020 Arthur, Park Ridge.

Buonaguidi, Lawrence, 51, 2618 N. Francisco.

Caifano, Marshall, 54, 222 N. Marion, Oak Park.

Campanelli, John, 49, 1401 Leymone, Melrose Park.

Campise, Jasper, 52, 1631 N. Newland.

Capone, Albert, 61, 1926 17th Ave., Melrose Park.

Capone, John Ermino, 63, 5427 Hyde Park.

Capone, Ralph, 74, Mercer, Wisconsin.

Cardenas, Albert L., 39, Route 20, Elgin.

Carrino, John A., 57, 7534 North Ave., Elmwood Park.

Caruso, Frank "Skid", 56, 215 West 23rd Street.

Caruso, Morris, 50, 218 W. 23rd St.

Catizone, Anthony, 40, 1710 17th Ave., Melrose Park.

Cernocky, Louis, 69, 111 Lincoln Ave., Fox River Grove.

Cerone, Frank John "Skip", 55, 4301 Judd, Schiller Park.

Cerone, Jack P., 53, 2000 N. 77th Ave., Elmwood Park.

Cesario, Sam, 49, 917 S. Bishop.

Ciapetta, Casper "John Carr", 49, 22 W. 326 Glen Park, Glen Ellyn.

Cicconte, Frank D., 36, 1611 N. 23rd, Melrose Park.

Cimitile, John, 61, 1025 N. Parkside.

Cordovano, James R., 46, 462 W. 28th Place.

Corngold, Joseph, 71, 1828 S. 59th Ct., Cicero.

Cortina, Dominic P., 45, 2021 N. 76th Ave., Elmwood Park.

Coviello, Roy, 54, 6666 Devon.

Daddano, William, Sr., 54, 8109 W. 26th St., North Riverside.

David, Herman, 78, 14823 Grant St., Dolton.

David, Orland, 47, Frankfort, Ill.

David, Robert, 45, 14823 Grant St., Dolton.

De Blase, John "Bananas", 66, 638 N. Euclid, Oak Park.

De Chiaro, Guido, 61, 1725 Thatcher, Elmwood Park.

De George, James, Hancock, Wisc.

De Grazia, Rocco, 70, 171 N. 25th Ave., Melrose Park.

De Lucia, Paul, 71, 1515 N. Bonnie Brae, River Forest.

De Lullo, Leo E., 38, 608 S. May.

De Rosa, Anthony, 52, 4252 N. Whipple.

De Rose, Salvatore, 46, 1210 S. Austin, Cicero.

De Stefano, Mario, 52, 2613 S. Mayfair, Westchester.

De Stefano, Sam, 56, 1656 N. Sayre.

Di Bella, Dominick, 64, 2603 W. Wright, McHenry.

Di Caro, Charles "Specs", 55, 706 W. 26th Street.

Dine, John T., 54, 7445 S. Kingston.

Di Pietto, Americo, 51, U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth.

Di Varco, Joseph, 56, 4275 Jarvis, Lincolnwood.

Donato, Dominic, 52, 6107 W. 80th Place, Oak Lawn.

Ehrenberg, Sam, 64, 8238 E. Prairie, Skokie.

Eldorado, Anthony "Tony Pine", 51, 5643 W. Madison.

Emery, Ralph, 57, 848 Memorial Drive, Chgo. Heights.

Emody, Alfred, 43, 1017 W. 100th Place.

English, Charles, 52, 1131 N. Lathrop, River Forest.

English, Sam, 50, 1800 S. Austin, Cicero.

Eto, Ken, 47, 1034 Grandville, Park Ridge.

Eulo, Frank "Sharkey", 60, 1838 N. 77th Ct., Elmwood Park.

Falbo, Frank J., 42, 311 N. Pine.

Fannon, John, 46, 149 S.E. 14th Lane, Miami.

Fecaratto, John, 38, 201 Michaux Road, Riverside.

Ferriola, Joseph A., 270 South Cote Road, Riverside.

Fezekas, John, 57, 561 Ingram, Calumet City.

Fidanz, Guido, 38, 220 Arquilla Drive, Chgo. Heights.
 Frabotta, Albert "Obbie", 55, 3950 Lake Shore Drive.
 Franze, Frank, 1729 Cambridge, Flossmoor.
 Fratto, Frank, 60, 6300 N. Olcott.
 Frisch, Frank W., 2600 W. 25th Street.
 Gagliano, Joseph, 52, 1731 Thatcher, Elmwood Park.
 Gallo, Frank K., 8307 Olcott, Niles.
 Garambone, Nicholas, 3706 W. Huron.
 Giancana, Charles, 45, Rt. #1 Lexington Field, Palatine.
 Giancana, Sam, 58, 1147 S. Wenonah, Oak Park.
 Gianola, Leonard, 57, 7344 N. Tripp, Lincolnwood.
 Gilmer, Joseph, 58, 629 Selbourne Rd., Riverside.
 Glitta, Mike, 47, 238 N. Chester, Park Ridge.
 Godfrey, Hyman, 59, 903 Newcastle, Westchester.
 Grieco, Joseph, 39, 4600 N. Overhill, Norridge.
 Griffin, Clarence, 41, 7144 S. East End.
 Hauff, Richard, 33, Marina City Apartments.
 Heckmyer, Max, 51, 6316 N. Mozart.
 Infelice, Ernest Rocco, 47, 1407 LeMoyné, Melrose Park.
 Inzerro, Vincent Joseph, 56, 2236 Northgate, North Riverside.
 Izzi, Eugene, 42, 13323 S. Commercial.
 Kapande, James, 48, 3430 W. Parker.
 Katz, Phil, 59, 2969 Sheridan Road.
 Klotz, "Morris" Maurice, 54, 3110 N. Sheridan.
 Kruse, Lester "Leslie Earl", 60, 8016 Prairie, Skokie.
 Kushner, Henry "Red", 59, 2400 N. Lakeview.
 La Porte, Frank, 66, 1730 Cambridge, Flossmoor.
 Lardino, John, 60, 1201 Belleforte, Oak Park.
 Larner, Hyman, 54, 1080 North Ave., Highland Park.
 Leader, David, 33, 5650 Kerbs.
 Le Gato, Anthony F., 37, 10340 S. Laramie, Oak Lawn.
 Liebe, Gus, 67, 3644 Lake Shore Drive.
 Lisclandrella, Frank, 49, 2136 W. Ohio.
 Lombardi, Joseph, 38, 2210 Ohio.
 Lo Russo, John, 43, 4558 S. LaCrosse, Mt. Prospect.
 Luzi, Frank, 39, 212 W. 29th Place, South Chgo. Heights.
 Mack, Florence, 39, 1619 N. Whipple.
 Maggio, Donald, 40, 1624 N. Broadway, Melrose Park.
 Mancini, Dominick, 36, 1629 N. Paulina.
 Manfredi, Leo, 51, 1873 S. Austin, Cicero.
 Maniscalco, Anthony, 5634 Goodman.
 Manno, Pat, 34, 1101 Lyman, Oak Park.
 Manzella, John, 44, 4503 N. Kedzie.
 Martin, Fred, 43, 9326 N. Keeler, Skokie.
 Matassa, John, 47, 1655 N. Nashville.
 Mayes, Bernard, 36, 4833 Winthrop.
 McDonnell, Robert, 42, 1246 Franklin Ave., River Forest.
 McGuire, Doyle, 32, 2421 S. Sawyer.
 McGuire, William, 44, 1419 W. Garfield.
 Menolascino, Anthony, 35, 2541 N. 74th Court, Elmwood Park.
 Mercurio, Sam, 44, 3357 N. Nottingham.
 Messina, William J., 47, 2037 N. 77th Ave., Elmwood Park.
 Meyers, Joseph "Yussie", 661 Sheridan.
 Minkus, Sam, 50, 1127 W. Albion.
 Mirro, James "Cowboy", 42, 1548 S. 61st Ct., Cicero.
 Monaco, William, 28, 625 Washington, Oak Park.
 Nasse, George Victor, 37, 5231 Sheridan Rd.
 Nasser, Arthur N., 39, 616 W. Grace Street.
 Nicoletti, Carl, 55, 5673 Washington Blvd.
 Nicoletti, Charles, 50, 1638 N. 19th Ave., Melrose Park.
 Nuccio, Dominic, 73, Webster Hotel.
 Oberlander Aaron, 50, 40 East Oak.

Ori, Peter, 3817 Scott St., Schiller Park.
 Orlando, Anthony, 52, 5040 S. LaCrosse.
 Orlando, Frank, 48, 5626 N. Campbell.
 Palermo, Nick, 58, 1201 N. Broadway, Melrose Park.
 Panzica, Anthony, 53, 5612 St. Charles Rd., Berkeley.
 Paternoster, Rocco, 48, 919 Cumberland, Park Ridge.
 Patrick, Leonard, 54, 2820 W. Jarlath.
 Photakis, George, 41, 3405 S. Cuyler, Berwyn.
 Photakis, John, 47, 908 S. Keeler & 3405 S. Cuyler, Berwyn.
 Pierce, Ralph, 62, 7743 S. Merrill.
 Pinelli, Anthony, 67, 6054 School Street.
 Policheri, Ben, 51, 8745 Oleander, Niles.
 Potenzo, Rocco, 54, 8857 N. Kildare, Skokie.
 Pranno, Rocco, 51, U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth.
 Prio, Ross, 6485 Sauganash, Lincolnwood.
 Raimondi, Matt, 43, 6360 N. Lowell.
 Romanelli, Michael, 46, 619 S. Loomis & 625 S. Loomis.
 Rosa, Sam "Slicker", 48, 805 N. 20th Ave., Melrose Park.
 Rosenthal, Frank "Lefty", 38, Formerly of North Bay Village, Fla.
 Reed, Robert J., 4121 N. Sheridan.
 Ross, Charles, 35, 4628 Kenmore.
 Rossi, Joseph, 30, 2216 S. Cicero Ave., Cicero.
 Roviario, Albert, 47, Cedar Lake, Indiana.
 Rugendorf, Leo, 52, 4020 Chase Ave., Lincolnwood.
 Ruthstein, Milton, 58, 7823 Jeffrey.
 Saletko, Morris "Maesh Baer", 52, 4255 Chase Ave., Lincolnwood.
 Salvatore, Rocco, 56, 1114 N. Ridgeland Ave., Oak Park.
 Sansone, Ernest, 69, 6860 N. Loron.
 Santucci, Frank, 45, 13 Pulaski Rd., Calumet City.
 Sarillo, Joseph, 28, 4830 W. Thomas.
 Saulters, Jean B., 43, 8145 S. Houston.
 Sawyer, Harold, 44, 5630 N. Fairfield.
 Schubert, Jerry, 2906 W. 82nd Street.
 Schuster, Simon, 47, 1691 Berkeley, Highland Park.
 Seidler, Wayne, 38, 10025 Grand Ave., Franklin Park.
 Seritella, Chris, 46, 719 N. Kenneth.
 Shapiro, Helene, 26, 5173 Hollywood.
 Smith, Alyce M., 39, 4116 N. Damen.
 Smith, Arthur, 36, 5234 S. Michigan.
 Spadavichio, Joseph, 39, 7633 W. Armistage, Elmwood Park.
 Spilotro, Anthony J., 29, 1102 Maple, Oak Park.
 Stein, Benjamin R., 61, 3300 N. Lake Shore Drive.
 Sullivan, John D., 39, 5234 S. Dorchester.
 Sullivan, Louis H., 33, 2822 S. Sawyer.
 Szumal, Ray, 38, 6347 S. Lamon.
 Teller, Sheldon R., 47, 9736 S. Longwood Drive.
 Tocco, Albert Caesar, 37, 20507 Dutra Ave., Chicago Heights.
 Tolomeo, Phil "Philly Beans", 40, 1829 N. Thatcher, Elmwood Park.
 Torello, James "Turk", 36, 1836 S. 60th Court, Cicero.
 Tornabene, Anthony, 49, 8 West Polk.
 Tornabene, Frank, 51, 6605 N. Rockwell.
 Tornabene, Louis, 52, 7130 Euclid Avenue.
 Tufanelli, George "Babes", 71, 11860 S. Bell.
 Varello, John, 41, 1519 Bonnie Brae, River Forest.
 Vercillo, James, 52, 1537 N. 17th Ave., Melrose Park.
 Visco, Nick, 58, 7139 Milwaukee Avenue, Niles.
 Vogel, Edward, 73, 7730 N. Milwaukee Ave., Niles.
 Volpe, Dominick, 51, Plum Grove Estates, Palatine.
 Williams, James "Kid Riviera", 45, 8005 S. Calumet.
 Wolcuff, Robert, 32, 10081 Frontage Rd., Skokie.

Wolcuff, Sanford Burton, 29, 555 W. Cornelia.

Yaras, David, 53, 3600 N. Lake Shore Drive.
 Zapas, Gus, 50, 4900 Morse, Skokie.

THE NINE DANGER SIGNS OF THE SOCIAL CANCER KNOWN AS ORGANIZED CRIME

There are nine recognizable signs that organized crime is moving in on a community: Social acceptance of hoodlums in decent society.

Your community's indifference to ineffective local government.

Notorious mobster personalities in open control of businesses.

Deceptive handling of public funds.

Interest at very high rates to poor risk borrowers (the juice loan).

Close association of mobsters and local authorities.

Arson and bombings.

Terrorized legitimate businesses.

Easily found gambling, narcotics and prostitution.

We have referred to organized crime as a social cancer because of the consequences to a community that its continuing growth promises. The man on the street should recognize these danger signs as leading to potential trouble; we shall examine them briefly.

Social Acceptance. Social acceptance of hoodlums in decent society allows the gangster to receive the benefits of group living without sharing its responsibilities. Persons who consort with the hoodlums close their eyes to the impact they have on decent society. Take taxes as an example—you pay yours, but what about the hoodlum who lives down the street? If he is a businessman, did he take your money for state sales tax and then fail to turn it over to the state? What would your estimate be of increased revenues if all the hood-dominated enterprises paid their fair share of taxes? Is that "golfing partner" at the country club the one who receives the ultimate profit from 200 teenagers hooked on dope this year? Is that "part-time" legitimate businessman the one who gave the nod that resulted in one of the 1,000 gangland slayings? Do not associate with hoodlums.

Your Local Government. Has your community become indifferent to ineffective local government? Weak local government is the environment in which organized crime flourishes. Know your local government, participate in it and do not allow it to be ineffective.

Notorious Mobsters' Controlling Business. Notorious mobster personalities in open control of businesses that may be listed in a "front's" name is a fairly strong sign that your community is being infiltrated by the mob. When you see the man who cannot legally own a tavern or bar keeping his hands in the cash register, telling the employees what to do and making the purchases for the business it isn't because of special business skills. When you see this phenomenon ask yourself whether you are really interested in furthering the cause of organized crime, for this may be exactly what your dollars are doing. Refuse to patronize hoodlum businesses.

Deceptive Handling of Public Funds. Deceptive handling of public monies is not a new toy to the mob. One certainty is that it is quite difficult for an honest audit of the books to be made when the books are always in someone's brief case and for some odd reason this is the only set of records in existence. Again, take part in local government and keep the mobsters out.

Interest at High Rates. The juice loan follows the poor-risk gambler who cannot borrow from any other source to make another bet or roll another seven. Sometimes the unsuspecting find themselves in the grip of the "six for five" weekly interest rate loan shark. The majority of those hooked on the juice have no other source for financial as-

sistance. Refuse to deal with these men and notify the authorities when you see them operate.

Close Association of Mobsters and Public Officials. When mobsters and public officials are so brazen as to meet in public without an effort at explanation, the tie between them is strong. For a long period of time certain public officials have walked both sides of the street. The Chicago Crime Commission will call to the attention of the news media those continuing associations in the future as we develop them and as they are reported to us by the public. Inform the Chicago Crime Commission of those you observe.

Arson and Bombing. Arson and bombing are not hallmarks of healthy competition. These tactics are used to assure a noncompetitive market for the products and services of the syndicate. Report any knowledge you have of these tactics to the authorities.

Terrorized Legitimate Businesses. Extortion, labor racketeering and all other forms of violence in the business world are tools members of the syndicate have used to gain an interest in a business or to extract payoffs from the businessman who deals with them. Report threats promptly.

Easily Found Crime. Where gambling, narcotics and prostitution prevail, the mob is at work. The profits from these vices—contributed by the public—make up the bank account out of which the mob payroll is met, the official is bribed, our system is corrupted and the empire of organized crime gets its basic strength. When Fred J. Cook wrote "A Two Dollar Bet Means Murder," he described the syndicate lifeline. Do not patronize the bookie, the dope peddler, the prostitute—when you see them operate, notify the authorities.

These are the signs of the organized crime cancer. If you feel it has a grip on your community and want assistance, call the Chicago Crime Commission.

LEGITIMATE BUSINESS AND THE HOODS

The huge revenue the crime syndicate receives from gambling and other illicit enterprises has been used to infiltrate almost every type of legitimate business. Powerful underworld leaders have engaged in the food manufacturing, distribution and sales business, automobile sales, the steel industry, oil wells, dairy business, breweries, liquor sales and distribution, stock brokerage houses, banks, savings and loan associations, restaurants, nightclubs, real estate, coin machine business, garbage collection, trucking, insurance, travel agencies, parking lots, shopping centers, television and radio manufacturing. There are few types of businesses or industries that have not been touched at one time or another by organized crime investments and there have been instances where crime syndicates have controlled substantial segments of the economy. In numerous instances the leaders of organized crime have controlled labor unions. And in whatever activity organized crime engages, legitimate or illicit, its method of operation is the same—the maintenance of a monopoly through extortion and violence or imposing the fear of violence.

The concern the hood has relative to the internal revenue laws—particularly since the fall of "Scarface" Al Capone—along with the many advantages to be gained from undisclosed ownership of a business has resulted in the concealment of the organized crime element names from most of the businesses they own or control. This concealment through the use of the "respectable" front as the owner is a device that results in the unaware public pouring more and more money into the coffers of the mob.

The Chicago Crime Commission feels that the public should know those businesses in which the hoodlums have an ownership interest as well as those where the facts show some association between the owners or operators and known members of the syndicate.

The following lists are set forth to illustrate the variety of enterprises involved and are not intended to be all inclusive.

I

Businesses that have ownership in some degree listed in the name of a member of the Chicago Crime Syndicate:

Apex Amusement Corporation, 7730 North Milwaukee Avenue, Niles, Illinois: Owns and installs juke boxes in various locations throughout this area with the revenue derived from the play of the machines being divided between Apex and the location owner or lessee. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of Apex to be Julius Zimmeroff and Edward Vogel. The 1967 directors are Edward D. Vogel, Julius Zimmeroff and William W. Vogel. In 1950, in hearings then being conducted before the United States Senate Committee headed by Senator Kefauver, Edward Vogel was identified as being in control of all juke boxes in the Uptown District of Chicago, Cicero and other parts of Cook County, Illinois. In 1963 this same Vogel was identified by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

B & B Finance Company, 1272-78 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Shares this address with Moeller Brothers, Inc., furniture store. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the B & B officers as follows: James Bianco, president; Fiore Buccieri, secretary; and Melvin R. Parnell, registered agent. James Bianco is listed as president of Moeller Brothers, Inc. The 1963 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate identified Fiore Buccieri as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

B & D Acceptance Company, Inc., 2311 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a finance company dealing with local and some transient trade. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Charles English as president and Lorraine English as Secretary. Lormar Acceptance Company, Inc., and Lormar Distributing Company, Inc., are listed at the same address with the same officers. The United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations in October, 1963 identified Charles English as a top west side juke box racketeer in the Chicago crime syndicate. Charles English is married to Lorraine English.

Commercial Phonograph Survey, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Illinois: At the time this business was incorporated it had a listed purpose to promote understanding and public relations between location owners and operators of juke boxes and recorded music. The Illinois Secretary of State's records for the year 1965 revealed that the officers of the corporation were Michael Dale, president; Frank Smith, secretary; and Joseph Gagliano, treasurer. In 1965 this company was dissolved as a corporation but after that date there appeared in the Chicago papers an assumed name notice where the name Commercial Phonograph Survey, located at 25 East Chestnut Street, was reported along with the "true names and addresses of owners" being Michael Dale, 25 East Chestnut Street, and Joseph Gagliano, 25 East Chestnut Street. Frank Smith is a brother of Fred Smith who was reported along with Joseph Gagliano as being members of the Chicago crime syndicate by the 1963 United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee.

El-Car International Limited, 5939½ West Roosevelt Road, Cicero, Illinois: Manufactures and wholesales advertising specialties which commercial concerns buy to advertise and also as gifts for their employees. This firm was incorporated in Illinois in 1966 with the following officers: John Carr, president; Joseph Corngold, vice president; and Joseph Elkes, secretary-treasurer. John Carr, known

to police authorities as Kasper J. Clapetta, has been arrested several times on gambling charges. Joseph Corngold was identified by Louis Campagna (a top syndicate hood now dead), who testified before the Kefauver Senate Committee, that he was a partner in the El Patio Club (prominent Cicero gambling establishment) with Joseph Corngold. Corngold has been identified by other hoods as being a partner in several gambling establishments. Carr and Corngold are brothers-in-law.

H & H Restaurant, 203 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 records of the City of Chicago Collector's Office reflect that the licensee of the H & H Restaurant was Morris Saletko. Saletko is presently under a ten-year sentence for conspiracy in a syndicate oriented theft from interstate shipment ring that netted nearly \$1,000,000 in merchandise for the thieves. Saletko is still on the street pending the outcome of his appeal. It is interesting that during his trial he stated that he earns \$60 per week as a cashier in the H & H Restaurant. An astounding fact is that this wage has Saletko living in a \$55,000 home in Lincolnwood. The 1963 Senate Permanent Subcommittee listed Saletko as a member of the crime syndicate.

J & R Cleaners, 6410 West Roosevelt Road, Oak Park, Illinois: Operates self-service dry cleaners and laundries in the Chicago area. Other locations are 653 North Cicero Avenue, 3659 West Division Street, 4124 West 63rd Street and 6240 West Cermak Road, Berwyn. The owners and partners of this company in March, 1967 were Otello Ramelli and Joseph Farriola. Farriola is also known as Joe Ferriola and Joe Negal. Ramelli is married to Fiore Buccieri's niece. Joseph Ferriola was named in 1963 by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations as being a member of the Chicago syndicate.

Hyde-Park Insurance Agency, Inc., 1660 East 55th Street, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of this corporation to be Hyman Godfrey, president, and Maxwell Fields, secretary and treasurer. An April, 1963 police raid of the El Patio, 5015 Cermak Road, Cicero, Illinois, resulted in Godfrey's arrest. A surveillance of a meeting during August, 1963 of leading members of the Chicago crime syndicate—Tony Accardo, Frank Ferraro, Gus Alex, Ralph Pierce, John Cerone and Joseph Glimco—developed that Godfrey acted as the courier with telephone messages for the meeting hoods. Hyman Godfrey, whose true name is Gottfried, was identified as a member of the Chicago syndicate by the 1963 Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the United States Senate.

Lormar Acceptance Company, Inc., 2311 North Western Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a finance company which was listed in the 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records as having Charles English, president and registered agent, and Lorraine English, secretary. At the address listed for this corporation are the B & D Acceptance Company, Inc., and the Lormar Distributing Company, Charles English was identified as a member of the Chicago syndicate by the United States Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963.

Shirts Unlimited, 843 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois: Is a men's haberdashery open to the public. The State of Illinois Department of Revenue, under Sales Tax No. 35728, reveals the owners to be Joseph Arnold and Joseph DiVarco. The United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963 named Joseph Arnold and Joseph DiVarco as members of the Chicago crime syndicate.

II

Businesses that have an indirect connection with someone in the Chicago crime syndicate. This connection may be ownership of the business by a relative of one of the Chicago crime syndicate, continued business dealings with members of the Chicago crime

syndicate, personal associations between the owners and members of the Chicago crime syndicate, use of premises as meeting places for members of the outfit or employment of an active member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Alhara Management Corporation, 5206 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: builds hotels and motels under the name of the Trans-American Construction Company, Inc. They are then managed by the captioned corporation. Both businesses are listed at the Sheridan Road address. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list the officers of the subject corporation as Harry Boshes, president; Albert M. Nadolna, secretary.

Historically, Boshes has been identified with former North Clark Street strip tease joints as an operator having spent many years in this activity. In 1950 he was charged with beating two conventioners who protested paying \$28 for eight drinks. The battery was alleged to have been done with a baseball bat at the French Casino on North Clark Street. The license was revoked shortly thereafter and upon re-opening the name Albert Nadolna appeared as the new operator.

During the investigation of the Leo Foreman murder in 1963 the investigators discovered Boshes' name in the exclusive diary maintained by the murdered juice racket collector.

Jimmy Allegretti and Joey DiVarco were seen giving operating commands to Boshes when he was in the North Clark Street area. These are the same Allegretti and DiVarco who are listed in the Permanent Subcommittee records of the United States Senate as being members of the organized crime syndicate in Chicago.

B-G Builders, 5420 North Harlem Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list Sander Caravello, president; Katherine Miller, secretary.

Caravello has been arrested numerous times and in 1937 he was sentenced to prison for five years for conspiracy. In August, 1965 Sander Caravello was arrested along with Joseph Lombardi, Sam Mercurio, George Bravos and Willie Messino and all were charged with aggravated kidnapping, aggravated assault, intimidation and conspiracy to commit those crimes. This Willie Messino was identified as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963. The above juice trial resulted in a guilty verdict being returned against Lombardi, Mercurio, Bravos and Messino with a not guilty verdict returned against Caravello. During testimony at the trial, victims of these crimes testified that they were taken to the offices of B-G Builders where the demands for juice payments were made.

Belcore Electric Construction Company, Melrose Park, Illinois: The Illinois Secretary of State's records reveal that Anthony J. Belcore, reported in 1961 as owner of captioned company, is director of the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club. The Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club is located on property purchased by convicted bookmaker Donald J. Angelini. Angelini and his wife deeded the property to Anthony Eldorado. Eldorado is a convicted armed robber and was identified in the hearings on organized crime before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963 as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate. The taxes on the Santa Fe Gun Club property are paid by Joseph Scaramuzzo.

Investigators reported that Anthony Belcore was seen in the company of Frank and Flore Buccieri departing for a fishing village in Montana, in October, 1966. Both Buccieris were identified before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee as being members of the Chicago crime syndicate.

In March, 1967 the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club sponsored a dinner dance at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago and some of the individuals reportedly in attendance

were Joseph Aluppa, Ross Prio, Joey DiVarco, Dominic DiBella and Willie Messino, all having been identified as members of the Chicago crime syndicate before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee in 1963.

Bern Electric Company, Inc., 5937 W. Grand Ave., Chicago, Illinois: The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records list Bernard Grizaffi as president; Catherine Marchionne, secretary; Bernard Grizaffi, Sr., registered agent. Grizaffi senior died in 1960.

This company was involved in construction of homes for Jack Cerone and Frank Cerone. Bernard Grizaffi was a vice president of Eden Land and Building Company, 1963, at the same time that Frank V. Pantaleo appeared as Eden president. Frank Pantaleo is the owner of Frank V. Pantaleo Company which supplied the concrete work in the construction of the above homes. Pantaleo was once a partner with Charles "Cherry Nose" Gloe and Pantaleo was also active in the construction and remodeling of homes for such syndicate members as Anthony Accardo and Joseph Glimco. Eden Land and Building Company in 1965 listed Sam N. Syracuse and Alfonso J. Cardamone as partners. Cardamone opened a west suburban bank account under the name of the Northern Illinois Music Company listing himself, Joseph Glimco and Sam Battaglia as officers of the company.

Bernard Grizaffi and Sam Giancana's chauffeur, Dominic Blasi, were shown in a Northwest News photograph welcoming newcomers into their Schiller Park, Illinois, home.

Chicago Heights Distributing Company, 1524 Union Street, Chicago Heights, Illinois: Sells liquor to Chicago Heights and Kankakee, Illinois, taverns. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Sam Maculuso, president, 261 Highland Drive, Chicago Heights, Illinois; Nick Costello, secretary, 1412 Schilling Ave., Chicago Heights, Illinois; and James Giambrone, principal agent, 956 W. Webster Ave., Chicago, Illinois.

In August, 1961 Nick P. Costello attended the Accardo-Palermo wedding. During the trial of Anthony J. Accardo for violation of the income tax laws, John Maculuso testified as a witness, relating that he had purchased beer from Accardo during the time Accardo was supposedly a salesman for Premium Brewery.

Fullerton Wholesale Tobacco Distributor, 2634-38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Does business out of the same address as Zenith Vending Corporation. It deals in the distribution of tobacco products as indicated by its company name. The officers are Charles Buffano, president; Kenneth S. Leonard, treasurer; and Ben King, secretary.

Charles Buffano was manager for the Suburban Cigarette Service headed by Ralph Capone for twenty years.

Leonard is also president of the Zenith Vending Corporation and when interviewed by a metropolitan newspaper reporter in 1963 he admitted that Chicago hoodlum Ross Prio was employed by him.

Interest in this case is directed to the Illinois statutes which provide for a rebate to wholesale tobacco dealers up to and including the first \$700,000 purchased. After the \$700,000 figure is reached the rebate decreases.

Gildom Cleaners, 3335 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is operated by Dominic Carzoli. In 1966 he was arrested in a police handbook and wire room raid. Later in 1966 he was arrested again as a keeper of a gambling house in Chicago.

Records of the Illinois Secretary of State's office reveal that a Dominic Carzoli is president of the Leisure Lads Social Club which surprisingly is located at the same address as the cleaners. A telephone call to the Leisure Lads Social Club listing is answered as the Gildom Cleaners number.

Grizaffi and Falcone Contractors, Inc., 5937

West Grand Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is a real estate subdivider, developer and general contractor. The officers of this corporation are the same as the officers of Bern Electric Company, Inc., previously mentioned. These two firms share the same office residence number.

Kankakee Distributing Company, 136 West Charles Road, Kankakee, Illinois: The principals of this corporation are the same as the Chicago Heights Distributing Company mentioned previously. President Sam Macaluso associates with Joseph Costello, a well known Chicago Heights hoodlum. He is also known to have associated with Americo Amadio who was closely connected with the Calumet City, Illinois, strip tease joints—Club 21 and Derby Club—which were shut down by authorities in Calumet City, Illinois. Amadio is associated with Babe Tuffanelli and Frank LaPorte, leading members of the Chicago crime syndicate in the southern Cook County area.

Leonard Wholesale Tobacco Distributor, 2634-38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is another of the wholesale tobacco distributing companies operating out of the same address with the same principals as the Zenith Vending Corporation. Again, the \$700,000 figure at which tax rebates are decreased is mentioned.

Mayo Plumbing Company, Inc., 1827 North 25th Avenue, Melrose Park, Illinois: Is a successful plumbing and heating contracting firm who lists the officers as James Langone, Helen Severino and Jean Buonomo. Formerly the company was known as the Melrose Park Plumbing and Heating Company owned by Nick Palermo. Palermo has long been an associate of Chicago crime syndicate members. James Langone is married to Palermo's daughter. Helen Severino is his niece and Jean Buonomo has been an employee of his for a long time.

Maxwell Liquors Incorporated, 915-17 West Maxwell Street, Chicago, Illinois: Was incorporated in 1958 and lists Concetta Briatta as owner of the premises. She is the wife of Louis Briatta. Briatta has been observed in the past in the company of such Chicago crime syndicate members as Gus Alex and was identified by the United States Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1963 as being a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Milano Incorporated, 1169 North State Street, Chicago, Illinois: Is a restaurant under the direction of Anthony Amadeo, Ruth Amadeo and Louise Grieco. During the years, numerous surveillances have reflected that this restaurant has been frequented by such Chicago crime syndicate members as Dominic DiBella, Dominic Brancata, Albert Frabotta, Charles English, James Allegretti and Marshall Caifano, the latter two presently receiving their culinary appointments under the United States Bureau of Prisons chefs.

Moeller Brothers, Inc., 1272 North Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a retail furniture store open to the general public that listed its officers as James Bianco, Salvatore J. Bianco and Melvin R. Parnell to the Illinois Secretary of State's office in 1966. The same James Bianco and Melvin R. Parnell are listed as officers of the B & B Finance Company which is listed at the same Milwaukee Avenue address. In 1963 a major appliance company awarded six (6) all-expense-paid tour tickets to Madrid, Spain to Moeller Brothers, Inc. and James Bianco, as a sales promotional prize. Two of the six tickets were used by "Milwaukee" Phil Alderisio and Frank Buccieri.

Northwestern Candy & Tobacco Company, 3651 West Armitage Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: is a wholesaler of candy and tobacco products to retail businesses and vending machine operators. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect George Colucci, president and registered agent, and Vito

Colucci, secretary. George Colucci is a brother of Joseph Colucci who was identified before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Investigations as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Nu-Way Contracting Company, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois: Is a plumbing contractor located at 655 North Kedzie Avenue. On November 27, 1944 the company was originally incorporated as the Nu-Way Plumbing Service, Inc., with the incorporators being Henry Orth and Leslie Kruse. The 1967 annual report continues the name Henry Orth as president and director.

At the same Kedzie Avenue address is the Nu-Way Food Service Equipment Company, Inc., which company reflects the same officers as does the Nu-Way Contracting Company.

Frank V. Pantaleo Company, 8300 Center Avenue, River Grove, Illinois: Is active in the concrete construction business. Frank V. Pantaleo, the proprietor, resides at 1141 Fair Oaks Avenue, Oak Park, Illinois.

Pantaleo has long been associated with individuals high in Chicago crime syndicate circles. In 1954 he was a partner with Charles "Cherry Nose" Gioe. Since that time he has been associated with Eden Land and Building Corporation who listed as a partner Alphonse J. Cardamone, self-admitted associate of Joey Glimco and Sam Battaglia. Pantaleo has done construction work for such Chicago crime syndicate hoodlums as Anthony Accardo and Joey Glimco.

Pyramid Exploration Limited, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois: Engages in the development of general oil and gas drilling interests. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Stanley R. Kleimar, Jr., as president and director of the company. Stanley Kleimar was indicted with Marshall Calton by a Federal grand jury in 1966, charged with conspiracy and fraud in the interstate transporting of certain forged certificates. He was subsequently acquitted.

In October, 1966 the following persons departed from O'Hara Field for a fishing village in Montana: Flore Buccieri, Frank Buccieri, Tony Belcore, Stanley Kleimar and others.

Regal Vending Company, 754 Grant Street, Chicago Heights, Illinois: Is a cigarette vending company. During the 1960 income tax trial of Anthony Accardo, Joseph Lawrence Costello testified that he and one Ralph Emery started the subject company. Ralph Emery was identified in the 1959 Senate Rackets Committee investigation as a top crime syndicate boss. These Senate Rackets Committee investigators developed information linking Regal Vending Company's origins to Frank LaPorte and Frank Franze.

Sands Motel, 5301 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: Is one of a group of hotels-motels controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation with a separate corporation listing Foster Lake Realty Company, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers in both the Alhara Management Corporation and the Foster Lake Realty Company, Inc.

Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club, 91st Street & County Line Road, Hinsdale, Illinois: A non-profit organization incorporated in 1962. Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club sponsored a dinner dance at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in March, 1967 at which time one of the largest assemblages of syndicate members was observed by Chicago authorities.

Snack Time, 4100 Roosevelt Road, Hillside, Illinois: Previously known as the Slo-Dawn Restaurant, currently is operated by Damian Constantine as a short-order type restaurant. In November, 1961 Chicago syndicate member Sam DeStefano purchased this restaurant. The following year there was a change in the licensee from the niece of DeStefano; however, the City Clerk's office

records in Hillside reflect that the taxes on the building are paid by Sam DeStefano.

Spa Motel, 5414 North Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is another of the hotels-motels owned by the Trans-American Construction Company, Inc., and controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the officers of these two corporations to include the names Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna. The lounge in the Spa Motel was known to authorities as a hangout for Arthur "Boodie" Cowan who was recently found murdered, the body being in the trunk of his auto.

Thunderbird Motel, 7501 South Shore Drive, Chicago, Illinois: Is one of the group of hotels-motels controlled by the Alhara Management Corporation, this one under a separate corporation listing—The Thunderbird, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers of both corporations.

Tides Motel, 5230 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: Is another of the group of hotels-motels owned and controlled by Alhara Management Corporation, this one under the separate corporation listing of Foster Lake Realty, Inc. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Harry Boshes and Albert Nadolna as officers in both corporations.

Town Parking Stations, Inc., 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: controls parking lots at the following Loop locations: 410-16 South Wabash Avenue, 329 South Wabash Avenue and 401 South Wabash Avenue. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect the following persons as officers of this corporation: Alex B. Ponzio, president; Marie Ann Ponzio, secretary, treasurer, and registered agent, both at 332 South Michigan Avenue.

A newspaper clipping from the June 29, 1966 Chicago Daily News reported that the Monroe-Dearborn Stations, Inc., headed by Alex B. Ponzio, had planned to build a 5-story garage at 55-57 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois.

Alex Ponzio and Paul Richard DeLucia, a son of Paul DeLucia, also known as Paul "The Waiter" Ricca, are associated with Town Parking Stations, Inc., and are believed to hold principal positions with Renee and Associates, Inc., the owner of parking lots at 328 and 339 South Wabash Avenue which are leased to Airport Parking Company of America.

An automobile leased from Mars Oldsmobile by the Town Parking Stations, Inc., and driven by Paul DeLucia, Jr., was observed at the Santa Fe Saddle and Gun Club dinner-dance held at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in March, 1967.

The Marie Ann Ponzio who is listed in the records of the Secretary of State as an officer of Town Parking Stations, Inc., is a daughter of Paul DeLucia.

Trans-American Construction Company, 5206 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois: was the general contractor during the construction of the following motels: Dunes Motel, Thunderbird Motel, Tides Motel, Sands Motel, Delta Motel and 50th On The Lake Motel, and the American Motel of Gary, Indiana. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reveal the following officers for the subject company: Harry Boshes, president, and Albert Nadolna, Secretary.

Union Insurance Company of Illinois, 1221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois: is an agency that operates as a broker in the insurance field whose principal business is life and health insurance of union and welfare funds. Parent companies of the subject agency are the Health Welfare Agency of Georgia and the Costal Union Insurance Agency. The Illinois Department of Insurance records list the partners of this agency as Rose Dorfman and Allen Dorfman, her son,

Allen Dorfman is the stepson of Paul "Red" Dorfman who was identified in the Senate Rackets Committee hearings as the "corrupt labor leader who introduced James R. Hoffa to the midwest mob." Testimony before the Senate Committee hearings indicated that James R. Hoffa had personally selected this company to handle the Teamsters Union health and welfare insurance.

In April, 1964 Allen Dorfman and his stepfather, Paul Dorfman, were indicted by the Federal Government on charges of attempting to extort \$100,000 from a millionaire San Francisco insurance broker.

Unique Import Trading Company, 1644 North Honore Street, Chicago, Illinois: Shares office space with its affiliate, the M & E Sales Company. Unique operates as a consumer mail order firm with a mailing list of approximately 300,000 names.

The 1967 credit report reflects the subject company was believed to be incorporated January 3, 1967 with the following officers: Ronald Yaras, president; S. Z. Green, vice president; and Leonard Yaras, secretary-treasurer. S. Z. Green is believed to be identical with Sherman Z. Greenberg whose arrest record reflects a conviction for forgery in California in 1963. Ronald and Leonard Yaras are sons of David Yaras who was listed in the 1963 Senate Permanent Subcommittee records as a member of the Chicago crime syndicate.

Universal Vending Corporation, 2634-38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Operates as a cigarette vending machine company. The officers, according to the 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records, include Charles Buffano, president; Kenneth S. Leonard, treasurer and registered agent. This company is located at the same address with the Zenith Vending Company. Charles Buffano, prior to the incorporation of the subject company in 1963, was a manager of the Suburban Cigarette Service for Ralph Capone for many years. Leonard is the president of the Zenith Vending Company and in an interview with a Chicago Tribune reporter in 1963 admitted that Ross Prio was employed by him.

Wilco Tobacco Company, 2634-38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Is a cigarette vending company and a subsidiary of the Universal Vending Corporation located at the same address. The Universal Vending Corporation purchased the cigarette vending machines and routes from Wilco Tobacco and Music Company, Joliet, Illinois, in 1966. The Universal Vending Corporation uses the name of Wilco Tobacco Company, division of Universal Vending Corporation.

Zenith Vending Corporation, 2634-38 West Fullerton Avenue, Chicago, Illinois: Operates as a vending company handling cigarettes, candy, soda and coffee. The 1966 Illinois Secretary of State's records reflect Kenneth S. Leonard, president; Ben King, secretary; and Cyrus Garfield, registered agent. Garfield was murdered in 1963. The 1966 records continue to carry his name as the registered agent.

In a 1963 interview with a Chicago Tribune reporter Leonard is quoted as saying, "It is no secret that Ross Prio works for us." A July 31, 1967 Chicago Sun-Times news clipping reports that Ross Prio is identified as being on the payroll of the Attendant Service Corporation of which Kenneth Leonard is listed as president.

THE CHALLENGE

Virgil W. Peterson, Executive Director of the Chicago Crime Commission, poses the challenge to the community in these terms:

"Organized crime will cease to exist as a major problem in this country only when the vast majority of people merely assume the duties of good citizenship. Obviously included in such duties are the willingness to report information of known illicit activities to the authorities, the appearance as a witness

when necessary before a grand jury or trial jury, service on a jury when called and the impartial appraisal of the evidence without fear or favor.

"But the successful prosecution of crime syndicate leaders, as highly important as that may be, is only one phase of the battle against organized crime. As long as citizens continue to patronize those activities which give the underworld wealth and power—gambling, vice, loan sharking—the battle against organized crime will never be won. When a citizen asks the usual question, 'What are the authorities doing about organized crime?', he should be able to give a satisfactory answer to the query, 'What am I doing about organized crime?'"

October, 1967.

WASTE, HEAVY COST LAID TO JOB CORPS CENTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have long been critical of the Job Corps because of reported disciplinary problems, inordinately high cost per trainee, and an excessive drop-out rate. Recently, when the poverty bill was before the Senate, I supported an amendment to abolish the Job Corps.

Today's Washington Star carries an interesting story, by John Beckler, titled "Waste, Heavy Cost Laid to Job Corps Center."

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Mr. John Beckler's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WASTE, HEAVY COST LAID TO JOB CORPS CENTER
(By John Beckler)

A secret government report circulating on Capitol Hill presents a devastating picture of high costs, waste and disciplinary problems at a Job Corps center in California.

It shows that after two years of operation the estimated cost of the center had jumped from \$12.8 million to \$25.5 million, the drop-out rate was 55 percent and only 8 percent of the enrollees were placed in jobs related to their training. The report also discloses that within a 60-day period, dismissal was recommended for 93 enrollees on disciplinary grounds ranging from assault, robbery and extortion to use of marijuana and sex perversion.

ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

The report is a preliminary study of the Parks Job Corps Center at Pleasanton, Calif., by the General Accounting Office.

It was released on a "strictly confidential" basis to members of Congress to help them draft antipoverty legislation.

The Senate has already passed a bill extending the antipoverty program for two years and the House is due to act on a similar measure soon.

The GAO said it also sent a copy of the report last March to the Office of Economic Opportunity, which directs the antipoverty program, asking for its comments. It said it received no reply.

The center is operated by Litton Systems, Inc., on a deactivated military base about 40 miles southeast of San Francisco. It has a capacity of 2,200 men.

The GAO review covers the period from the opening of the center in early 1965 through last December. Since then, it notes, there have been some improvements in procedures and other changes are under consideration by the contractor.

Much of the report is devoted to the costs of the program, designed to provide youths between 16 and 21, most of them school dropouts from impoverished backgrounds, with job training and basic education.

The contract was originally negotiated at an estimated cost of \$12.8 million and a fixed fee for Litton of \$600,000, says the GAO. But by November 1966, the total cost was up to \$25.6 million including a fixed fee of \$683,079.

SALARIES A BIG FACTOR

The report fixed salaries of center employees as a major cost item, accounting for \$9.4 million when total costs were \$20.3 million. It said the center had a staff of 1,078 for 1,869 enrollees at the end of 1965. At the insistence of the OEO the staff was cut to 955 by the end of 1966, when enrollment was 1,762.

In all, it said, the costs pushed the average enrollee cost per year to \$11,000, although Congress has written into the antipoverty law a requirement that costs shall not exceed \$7,500 per enrollee.

CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATION STRIKE OUT ON CUTTING SPENDING—MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the struggle now going on in this Congress over how to cut an additional several billion dollars out of the budget should make resoundingly clear to us the necessity for establishing a system for determining priorities.

This is why I have risen on the floor day after day for weeks to propose that the Congress get on top of the kind of system of evaluation and priority determination that has at last brought order out of our chaotic defense spending.

Secretary McNamara has introduced a planning, programming, budgeting, technique that other Government departments have begun to adopt also.

This technique permits the departmental head to define his goals, assign priorities to those goals and then determine which of the various alternative methods of achieving the goal is the least costly.

Put another way, executive department heads are just beginning to apply the benefit cost evaluation to their departmental operation at least in part.

The Congress should hasten this process by constantly calling for the executive branch to give us their priorities and to justify those priorities.

This will provide us with a rational basis for determining our own priorities and deciding what should be reduced and what should not be cut.

If for example we had a set of priorities from the executive branch now, the problem of reducing an additional \$5 billion from the level of spending approved to date by the Congress would present a far simpler problem.

This is not to say the executive branch will easily surrender those priorities to us. Of course they would not. Armed with these priorities, the Congress could and I think would eliminate programs the executive wants even if the priority assigned to the project was relatively low. The executive does not want Congress to assert that kind of power.

But if the Congress insists on getting this kind of information, the administration would certainly have to make it available.

Mr. President, in this connection, the Milwaukee Journal has published an excellent editorial that calls for this kind of sensible ordering of national priori-

ties, economies that are logical and make sense.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY: FOR SOMEONE ELSE

Bluff, bluster and, at times, buffoonery have marred the Washington debate over budget cuts and a tax hike. However, the unseemly spectacle of President Johnson and congress (especially the Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the house) trying to make a monkey of each other has been instructive.

It has revealed with extraordinary clarity that it's much easier to prattle about "economy" than to practice it, particularly when the ax chops close to a pet project. Figures indicate that after defense spending, almost sacred in wartime, and other fixed commitments, such as veterans payments and installments on the national debt, not much of the badly unbalanced \$135 billion budget can be tampered with. And then the targets are likely to be education, health, urban revitalization and the poverty war.

This, in turn, suggests that budget battles will continue to be essentially foolish affairs until congress and the White House start to measure spending against a clear, re-evaluated set of national priorities and goals. Can the nation fight a major war abroad, shoot for the moon and still cope with urban upheaval? Can we save Saigon as well as Detroit—or Milwaukee? Can we probe the heavens without neglecting the inner city hell?

To pass, as the house did, a fuzzy resolution that would require the president to pare an unspecified \$6 billion to \$8 billion from current spending is no answer to basic questions of American purpose. Nor is a White House threat to freeze highway allocations and reduce mail service to four days a week.

There are many programs that can stand scrutiny—from space and supersonic transport to farm subsidy and public works (often a euphemism for favors to vested interests). As for more revenue, tax loopholes should be closed; there is no reason, for example, why nearly a score of millionaires pay no tax at all.

However, revenue and expenditures should be rationally related to explicit objectives. Both branches of government seem to rush ahead but they are not sure where.

STRENGTHENING STATE GOVERNMENT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in our federal system of government it is axiomatic that the whole can be strong and viable only if all parts of the structure—at all levels of government—are strong and viable. Today there is a growing realization that State government must be strengthened to cope with the multitude of problems facing it and to function effectively in our increasingly complex fabric of government.

Criticism of government—healthy, constructive criticism—is the primary tool that citizens of a free nation may use to focus the searing light of public attention on weaknesses and imperfections so that they may be remedied.

The September 1967 issue of the Kansas Government Journal published by the League of Kansas Municipalities carries a lead editorial by E. A. Mosher entitled "Criticizing and State Govern-

ment." In order that Mr. Mosher's thoughtful comments may be brought to the attention of all the Members, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICIZING AND STATE GOVERNMENT

Criticizing government is a favorite national pastime. Our national government seems to get the most brickbats, and is considered fair target for almost any kind of complaint. Next on the receiving line is local government, perhaps because of the "fish-bowl" accessibility of local officials. Finally, this writer believes, comes state government. But if state government has escaped the volume of complaints and requests for "reforms" which has traditionally been heaped on our national and local governments, that day apparently has stopped.

Two recent reports appear to be symptomatic of this trend. The influential Committee for Economic Development in July gave nationwide release of its report "Modernizing State Government," with criticisms about state geographic handicaps, outmoded structures, inadequate use of resources and political weaknesses comparable to those ascribed to local units in its 1966 report "Modernizing Local Government," (see September issue of the *Journal*, 1966).

Now comes the prestigious Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, in its study on federal aid streamlining, which notes that a good many of the states' problems posed by federal grants "center around the inadequacies of their governors' administrative, budgetary and fiscal controls and of their legislatures' oversight and appropriation functions." The commission has recommended:

State constitutions, where needed, be amended to permit the governor to succeed himself.

Amending state constitutions to reduce greatly the number of separately elected state officials.

Strengthening the governor's budget authority to provide more effective executive management over state agencies receiving federal grant funds.

Developing a strong state planning capability in the executive branch of state government for coordination of state agency plans now required by federal grant legislation as a condition to receiving funds.

Authorizing the governor to reorganize the administrative structure of state government and to shift functions among state departments and agencies, subject to a veto by either house of the state legislature within a specified time period.

"Beefing up" the governor's executive office staff by the states to adequately maintain overall management and coordination of federal-state programs.

The Commission also found that state legislative organization, staff assistance, specialized services, and institutional spirit are still geared largely to the simple problems and small population of bygone days. The performance of state legislature, according to the Commission, determines in large measure the success of a state in exercising its responsibilities in making the federal grant-in-aid system work. In this area, the commission recommended annual sessions for all state legislatures and providing year-around professional staffing for the major state legislature committees.

E. A. M.

SURVEILLANCE AND FREEDOM

Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. President, a recent issue of the *Carnegie Quarterly*, a publication of the Carnegie Corp. of

New York, contains an article entitled "Our Not So Private Lives: Surveillance and Freedom."

As this appears to be a very thoughtful approach to the problem of privacy, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NOT SO PRIVATE LIVES: SURVEILLANCE AND FREEDOM

If someone gained access to your suit jacket, through the good offices of your cleaner, say, or a public check room, he could turn you into a walking radio within a matter of minutes. A microphone could be placed in one button of the jacket, a transmitter in a second, and a battery in a third, with conductive wire matching the seam thread to serve as an antenna.

Such a unit is only one of the many marvels of technology that now make it possible for those so inclined surreptitiously to hear what a man says and watch where he goes and what he does. Microphones the size of a sugar cube, suitable for installation in office or bedroom, are available for less than \$10. There are cameras that can take good photographs from as far as a thousand yards, and a closed circuit television system the size of a cigarette pack that can send pictures from a wall socket where it might be hidden direct to the interested viewer's screen.

Modern-day surveillance, or spying, as some might put it, extends beyond the mere monitoring of an individual's words and actions. Mental tests, drugs, and emotion-measuring devices such as the lie detector provide for psychological surveillance as well. They can and do extract information about a person's innermost beliefs and attitudes—information which he might not know he is revealing, or might not wish to reveal, or might reveal without full awareness that he is exposing his private personality. The Constitution, incidentally, has attempted to protect citizens against having to divulge certain kinds of information—much of it, including attitudes toward religion, is of the sort we are dealing with here.

Finally, there is what might be called surveillance by data-processing. Computers make it easy for government, business, and other organizations to gather, save, and exchange more information about an individual than they could have (or would have wanted to, because of the difficulty of processing) only a few years ago. It is technologically possible that long before 1984, information about all important aspects of an individual's life could be collected on a running basis in master memory systems which would show at a glance how he did in nursery school and graduate school, the results of all the personality and aptitude tests he had taken over the years, how much he got paid for which job, his efficiency ratings, health record, and much more.

All of these developments, and others, make possible the almost total invasion of privacy—which is so intimately bound to freedom itself. While the framers of the Constitution clearly intended to establish the individual's inviolable right to a certain amount of privacy, neither legislation nor judicial interpretations have so far been able to cope effectively with the new problems posed by the new technology. For the right to privacy is not an absolute right; legitimate claims can be made for some surveillance under some conditions for some reasons. What has been lacking is a kind of Twentieth Century definition of what constitutes the proper balance between privacy and disclosure and suggestions as to how the balance might be achieved. These are the subjects of *Privacy and Freedom*, by Alan W. Westin, professor of Public Law and Gov-

ernment at Columbia University. The book will be published at the end of the summer by Atheneum Publishers (\$10). Mr. Westin's study, which was made under the auspices of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, was supported by a Carnegie grant to the Association.

FOUR FUNCTIONS OF PRIVACY

In the totalitarian state, the right of authorities to keep the activities of citizens and groups under close surveillance is assumed, while the regime itself operates in tight secrecy. In a democracy, the situation is nearly reversed.

"The democratic society relies on publicity as a control of government and privacy as a shield for group and individual life," writes Mr. Westin. (Even government, however, has the right and necessity to carry on some of its business in private.) The democratic emphasis on privacy springs from the fundamental belief of the democratic creed—in the uniqueness and sacredness of the individual. But as sociologist Robert Merton has pointed out, "Privacy is not merely a personal predilection; it is an important functional requirement for the effective operation of social structure." For the democratic social structure, Mr. Westin argues persuasively, privacy performs four very important functions.

The human being has a deep need for personal autonomy—the sense of having some control over his own life and, of course, mind; the knowledge that he is not dominated or manipulated wholly by others; the ability to choose when and what to disclose to others about himself. Psychologists have described a series of zones or regions of privacy leading to the "core self" which shields the individual's ultimate secrets. There are some hopes and fears that a person wants never to reveal to anyone. Only grave social need, says Mr. Westin, "can ever justify destruction of the privacy which guards the individual's ultimate autonomy." And the democratic society itself is strengthened when individuals have a sense of personal autonomy, since it produces traits that are desirable in citizens of a free state: independent thought, diversity of views, and nonconformity.

The second great function of privacy, Mr. Westin points out, is to provide for emotional release. In the course of any given day, everybody plays a succession of roles—"stern father, loving husband, car pool comedian, skilled lathe operator"—and everybody needs an occasional opportunity to lay the masks aside, to be "himself" as he feels at the moment. Privacy also furnishes the safety valve without which our social and public life might be even more disorderly and tempestuous than it is. All people, including janitors and statesmen, need at times to blow off to intimates without fear of being taken really seriously, let alone reported. They need to be able privately to vent their anger and frustration—even maliciously, slanderously, or profanely—in order to be able publicly to think and behave with reason, dispassion, and decorum.

Privacy also provides the opportunity for self-evaluation: for reflection, for intellectual and emotional integration, and for inspection of the conscience. Finally, it permits limited and protected communication.

"The greatest threat to civilized social life would be a situation in which each individual was utterly candid in his communications with others, saying exactly what he knew or felt at all times. The havoc done to interpersonal relations by children, saints, mental patients, and adult 'innocents' is legendary." Limited and protected communication leaves us free to maintain the psychological distance which seems appropriate to various relationships and situations; it also means that a man can share confidences with his intimates and professional or religious counselors.

Human beings need privacy, but they have

similarly powerful needs for disclosure, for sharing, for companionship. Each individual is engaged in the continuous process of making adjustments between his changing needs for solitude and company, intimacy and general social intercourse, reserve and disclosure. "A free society," Mr. Westin writes, "leaves this choice to the individual, for this is the core of the 'right of individual privacy'—the right of the individual to decide for himself, with only extraordinary exceptions in the interests of society, when and on what terms his acts should be revealed to the general public."

Privacy performs the same basic functions for organizations that it does for individuals. It contributes to the achievement of organizational autonomy, releases the organization members from formal role compliance, provides internal evaluation to prepare policies, and protects the organization's limited communication with others. Privacy, says Mr. Westin, is "not a luxury for organizational life; it is a vital lubricant of the organizational system in free societies."

A NEW GAME BY OLD RULES

By definition, all societies, whether primitive or modern, totalitarian or free, exert some sort of social control. Surveillance is one obvious means of doing so.

"Parents watch their children, supervisors watch employees, religious leaders watch the acts of their congregants, policemen watch the streets and other public places, and government agencies watch the citizens' performance of various legal obligations and prohibitions." Fair enough, Mr. Westin would say. A good deal of indirect surveillance (through the keeping of records, for example) is necessary to ensure that citizens pay their taxes and their parking tickets, and sometimes direct surveillance is required to maintain order. This has always been so. But the invention of the telephone, the camera, the lie detector, and the development of psychological tests have changed the playing of the game without a corresponding alteration in the rules of the game. What is at question is the current and proposed use of the new techniques.

Proponents of the no-holds-barred approach welcome the increasing sensitivity of surveillance devices as being protective of society and also, they say, of the individual himself. They reason that no accused person who is innocent should object to taking a lie detector test; that no one who is not plotting a crime should object to the fact that his telephone conversations are overheard by police; that no one who approves of proper personnel selection and placement should object to personality tests. They argue, as Mr. Westin says, that "the individual himself can now prove his innocence, virtues, or talents by 'science' and avoid the unjust assumptions frequently produced by 'fallible' conventional methods."

There are several arguments to be made against this plausible-sounding line of reasoning, perhaps the least important of which is that some of the surveillance devices are not scientifically perfect. Even if they were, the essential point is that the knowledge or fear of surveillance has a restrictive effect on human behavior, and not just on illegal behavior. It impairs many of the crucial functions that privacy performs—reduces personal autonomy, limits the opportunity for emotional release, lessens limited and protected communication. Who would ever put forward a tentative conclusion, "think out loud," make a heatedly damaging remark about the President, or, for that matter, make a declaration of love if he thought he was not only being overheard but that his words were being recorded?

The personality tests being widely used for purposes of personnel selection by government and business organizations invade the individual's very mind and heart, his

ultimate "self." They inquire directly and indirectly into his attitudes and beliefs about religion, sex, and politics. People who object to this intrusion into hitherto protected realms consider it of small comfort that the purpose is not to find out specifically what they think on certain issues but to elicit a kind of psychological profile of themselves that can be measured against some "norm." Many individuals, Mr. Westin says, "do not want themselves to be sorted and judged according to standards that rest on the unexplained evaluations of professional psychologists in the employ of 'institutional' clients." Those who resist the tests say, in effect, to those in power: "If you make evaluative decisions openly, questioning me directly and justifying your decisions openly, I can fight out publicly your right to judge me in a certain way and American society will decide our conflicting claims, but if you invoke 'science' and 'expertise' and evaluate me through personality tests, the issue becomes masked. . . . Thus, where there are basic issues such as political ideology, religion, or race at stake, the selection process must be objective and public, and I assert my right of privacy to close my emotions, beliefs, and attitudes to the process of job evaluation in a free society."

KEEPING BIG BROTHER IN CHECK

Emotionally satisfying as it would be to take a decisive swipe at Big Brother, it would be unwise and unenforceable to grant all "private" acts total immunity from surveillance by device. Mr. Westin acknowledges. "The critical challenge now is to develop new public policies to protect privacy from unreasonable surveillance." What is needed is a rational weighing process with definite criteria by which claims for disclosure or surveillance can be gauged. He suggests five.

First, the seriousness of the need to conduct surveillance must be strongly established.

"Police want to solve crimes, corporations to control thefts, employers to select more successful employees, news media to tell the 'inside' story about leading persons and events, educators to identify personality problems in school children, behavioral scientists to observe real-life situations. But if all that need be done to win legal and social approval for surveillance is to indicate a social need and show that surveillance would help cope with it, there is no balancing at all, only a qualifying procedure for a licence to invade privacy. Therefore, the need involved must be serious enough to overcome the very real risk of jeopardizing the public's confidence in its daily freedom from unreasonable invasions of privacy."

Second, there are often several methods available to accomplish a given social end. The burden of proof should be on those who seek authorization for surveillance to show that there are not alternative techniques available which do less violence to individual and organizational privacy. The need for bugging and wiretapping to control crime, for example, has not been publicly proved on any crime-by-crime type of analysis. Mr. Westin personally believes that the case probably could be made for use in crimes such as extortion and kidnapping, but it has not been made in a satisfactory or convincing way. As for personality testing, there has been no research under scientific control procedures indicating that personnel selected by such measures are more successful than those chosen by other means—on the basis of their past work records, interviews, aptitude and achievement tests, and the like. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever that the many organizations which do not use such tests—RCA, Du Pont, Metropolitan Life Insurance among them—hire larger numbers of emotionally disturbed employees than those that do.

Third, the degree of reliability of the sur-

veillance instrument must be taken into account. The personality test is simply too unreliable to justify use by governmental or private organizations, Mr. Westin says, particularly "given the fact that the questions used in many such tests intrude into otherwise protected areas of personal life and private beliefs, and that preserving attitudes of nonconfession to authorities is a high social goal in American society." And when devices which are not now reliable enough (lie detectors, for example) eventually are perfected, as seems likely, society must then face the question of whether the process should be permitted even if it is wholly scientific. At any rate, no device which is not proved reliable beyond a doubt should ever be used without the individual's freely given consent.

The problem of consent to invasion of privacy, the fourth consideration, is a complicated one. Is an individual's consent implied by the fact that he accepts a certain kind of job, or that he has permitted certain kinds of surveillance previously? School teachers, for example, are accustomed to having their classrooms visited by principals; does their consent to this long-standing practice imply consent to the use of loudspeaker boxes by which administrators can monitor a classroom without the knowledge of teacher or pupils? A particularly difficult case is presented when employers require privacy-invasive tests as a condition of getting a job or a promotion. In certain areas, American law does not allow individuals to waive their rights when their bargaining power is inadequate; "yellow dog" contracts, for example, under which workers promise not to join a labor union as the price of getting a job, are prohibited. Mr. Westin says that the nature of consent must be "carefully examined in each instance to see how freely given or how coerced it is in the full context."

Finally, there must be the capacity for limitation and control on those occasions when surveillance will be employed without the knowledge or consent of the surveyed. When, and under what safeguards, may the devices be used?

RULES FOR SURVEILLANCE

Mr. Westin suggests four basic steps. Rules should be set limiting those who may carry out the surveillance (for example, police should not be permitted to use eavesdropping devices, Mr. Westin believes). Detailed regulations should be set for the scope, duration, and operation of the surveillance. Rules of scope would determine, for example, what questions could be asked and what questions could not be asked in personality tests; they would also specify the types of crime for which physical surveillance is permitted. The duration of surveillance should preferably be of short, renewable periods.

A general agency should be created to set the standards, supervise practices under the rules, investigate compliance, and hear complaints, Mr. Westin says. And having set the rule for the surveillance itself, rules governing disclosure and use of the information obtained must be formulated.

In order to achieve control of surveillance technology, action by the federal and state legislatures and by the courts will be necessary. Mr. Westin says that legislation should be considered to apply to the three kinds of surveillance: psychological, data, and physical. He also believes that the Supreme Court shows signs of being ready "to identify a comprehensive privacy right based on the Constitution." The sections of *Privacy and Freedom* discussing possible legislative statutes and judicial alternatives are required reading for those in a position to act on them. But most of us are not lawyers or legislators or jurists, and Mr. Westin reminds us pointedly that individual citizens and private organizations and the professions have extremely important roles to play in

protecting privacy and freedom. The fight against subliminal advertising, he points out, was won "not by legislation or judicial intervention, but by the force of civic and public opinion." He is encouraged that the moral concern and consciousness of influential individuals and groups running the political spectrum from right to left has been aroused, and believes that the climate of public opinion may now be ready "to support effective organizational and legal action to safeguard privacy, if such action can be intelligently framed and effectively presented."

Mr. Westin invites the scientific community, whose efforts in this area have been largely directed to developing more effective instruments of surveillance, to devise more scientific countermeasures—scrambling devices and the like—by which privacy can be protected. Organizations can exercise self-restraint in their personnel and other policies on behalf of the values of privacy. And he believes that the "enforcement of professional ethical standards protecting privacy could accomplish a great deal," citing the current debate among psychologists over the use of personality tests as a healthy sign.

"American society now seems ready—for the first time in a century—to face the impact of science on privacy and to restore the equilibrium among privacy, disclosure, and surveillance that was, until the 1880's, one of the greatest achievements of American law and liberty," Mr. Westin concludes. Perhaps we can lead the way. For the problem is not solely an American one.

"Sometimes in the name of Man and sometimes in that of Society, scientists throughout the West are at work to unlock man's mind through drug and brain-wave research. . . . Throughout the industrialized nations of the world, the computer networks grow, collecting their millions of bits of data, depositing the smallest details of the citizens' lives in the unforgetting and unforgiving memory units."

The technology is new. "But the choices are as old as man's history on the planet. Will the tools be used for man's liberation or his subjugation?"

NEW SUPPORT FOR FLAMING GORGE STATE FISH AND GAME PROTECTION AMENDMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have received new and welcomed support from an important body in my State for an amendment I have offered to S. 444, the Flaming Gorge Recreation Area bill.

I heartily endorse the Flaming Gorge legislation as a whole, but have deep reservations over section 4 which would give the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over fish and game programs which have historically been administered by the State.

Support for my amendment to correct this in the bill has been voiced in a resolution by the State of Utah Coordinating Council of Natural Resources. The council handles all official State business in the natural resources field from water to recreation.

In its resolution, the council said it is deeply concerned with the present wording of the legislation "which does not specifically delineate State and Federal jurisdiction over fish and wildlife on the proposed recreational area."

The group "strongly urges" that the present wording be changed to that in my amendment, offered last week during hearings on the proposal before the Senate Interior Committee.

In addition to the State Coordinating Council of Natural Resources, support for the amendment has come from the Utah State Fish and Game Department, the Utah Department of Natural Resources, the Wyoming Game and Fish Commissions, the Western Conference of the Council of State Governments, the International Association of Fish and Game Conservation, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

All of these groups realize the precedent we may be setting here by allowing an agency of the Federal Government virtually to take over the fish and game operation on all Federal lands.

I would like to have inserted in the RECORD the resolution passed by the council.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COORDINATING COUNCIL OF THE UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, OCTOBER 19, 1967

Whereas, the Coordinating Council of the Utah State Department of Natural Resources has reviewed S. 444, which would establish the Flaming Gorge recreational area; and

Whereas, the Coordinating Council is deeply concerned with the wording of Section 4 of S. 444, which does not specifically delineate state and federal jurisdiction over fish and wildlife on the proposed recreational area; and

Whereas, the Federal Government through the Department of the Interior on several occasions has indicated that they do have jurisdiction on fish and wildlife administered by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, the question of jurisdiction of fish and wildlife on federal lands has become an increasing problem between state and federal agencies involved.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Coordinating Council of the Utah State Department of Natural Resources hereby strongly urges that the wording of S. 444 on Page 3, Section 4 be amended as follows:

"The Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on the lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreational area in accordance with applicable state laws. Hunting shall be permitted in accordance with federal laws only as they pertain to migratory birds."

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be sent to the appropriate Congressional delegation.

PRESERVING PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, inefficiency in government is almost always unwanted. But the Christian Science Monitor, quoting the Buffalo Evening News, suggests that in relationship to our individual privacy, perhaps "conscious inefficiency rather than super-efficiency could preserve our essential privacy."

This same conclusion seemed to run through the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure's recent hearings on computer privacy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published in the Monitor of October 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING PRIVACY

A group of American experts on international law and politics is urging the United

Nations to study the growing threat of computers and electronic snooping devices to individual freedom and privacy.

Quite properly, the group foresees grave potential dangers in "the merry march of technology and science without adequate consideration of the social effects of their findings."

Take only one example—storing countless separate details about every individual citizen in a central computer bank in Washington. Then all any efficient bureaucrat need do is press a button and—swish—out pops one person's life, replete with intimate details from his income tax returns, his census answers, his war and police records down to overdue parking tickets.

How very, very efficient. And, it seems to us, how very, very dangerous.

One reason the "merry march" to efficiency hasn't gone faster than it has, the American group observes, is that at present "the multiplicity of agencies and procedures and the resulting red tape protect the individual against undue invasion of his privacy by making it more difficult for various government officials to cause real trouble."

If that is true, there is more merit in red tape and bureaucratic confusion than we had realized. And perhaps this suggests an answer to the very real threat of government invasion of individual privacy.

We aren't recommending an official policy of keeping the red tape hopelessly snarled, of course. But in this time of increasingly sensitized snooping devices and rapid computer development, it surely isn't premature to consider a conscious public policy of fragmenting information about individuals by storing them in separate agencies and prohibiting, by strict law, the exchanging of this information among those agencies. On that narrow point of collecting and storing personal information, conscious inefficiency rather than super-efficiency could preserve our essential privacy.

UTAH RECEIVES NEW MEASUREMENT STANDARDS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, according to an announcement from the Department of Commerce, the State of Utah will be the fourth State to receive a new set of replacement weights and measures standards. This event will take place in Salt Lake City on Monday, October 30. Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, will present the replacement standards to Gov. Calvin L. Rampton. Eventually, all 50 States will receive new sets of weights and measures standards. As a sidelight to this important occasion, I should like to note that Dr. Astin, a highly respected Government scientist and administrator, will no doubt take extra pleasure from the ceremony, since he is a native son of Salt Lake City, and completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Utah. The significance of this program, however, is more than symbolic. In the modern world, trade and commerce demand a degree of uniformity in measurement that is not possible to achieve with the existing standards in the various States. Many of these standards are more than 100 years old. There are variations among them, and the mass-market, mass-production economy of America today requires a better measurement foundation than the standards presently used by most States. The field of weights and measures is an interesting example of Federal-State relationships. Regulatory powers lie with

the States. The Federal Government serves as a technical adviser to the States. This pattern might well be followed in other fields of joint responsibility. For the information of all Members, I ask permission to insert the announcement from the Commerce Department in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON, UTAH RECEIVE NEW WEIGHTS AND MEASURES STANDARDS

In the next four days, Oregon and Utah will become the third and fourth States to receive new weights and measures standards under a program to replace the standards of all 50 States.

Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Bureau of Standards, will present one new set of weights and measures standards to Governor Tom McCall of Oregon at a ceremony on Friday (October 27, 10:00 a.m.) at the new Agriculture Building in Salem. Dr. Astin will present an identical set to Governor Calvin L. Rampton of Utah on Monday (October 30, 3:00 p.m.) at the Department of Agriculture Laboratories, Salt Lake City.

Many of the standards and instruments used by the States in weights and measures administration were provided by the Federal Government 100 years ago or more. The National Bureau of Standards is supervising replacement of the State standards to update and extend measurement competence throughout the Nation as required by scientific and technological advances. Within the next few months sets will be presented to California, Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, New Mexico, and Tennessee.

It is expected that new standards and instruments will be provided to about 10 States per year until all State standards facilities have been modernized.

Each new set includes standards of mass (weight), length, and volume and necessary laboratory instruments, including high precision balances, all specially designed to meet State weights and measures requirements. Each set costs the Federal Government about \$70,000, including calibration, installation, and training of laboratory personnel. The State contribution to the program, in the form of new or expanded laboratory facilities and better qualified personnel, will be considerably more than the Federal cost.

Measurement uniformity among the States began in 1838 when Congress authorized the Federal Government to supply each State with "... a complete set of weights and measures adopted as standards—to the end that a uniform standard of weights and measures may be established throughout the United States."

In the United States, the actual regulation of weighing and measuring equipment in commerce is retained largely by the States. The National Bureau of Standards is the principal technical resource for the States in this area.

DECISIONMAKING AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a guest article which appeared in the October 24, 1967, Morgantown, W. Va., Dominion-News, titled "Decisionmaking at the United Nations."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DECISIONMAKING AT THE UNITED NATIONS

(NOTE.—This article was written by the Collegiate Society for International Affairs at West Virginia University for United Na-

tions Day today. Dr. John Jacobson is adviser.)

Today, most of the major problems of this complex world rest upon the United Nations. Six main organs compose the structure of the United Nations—the General Assembly, Security Council, Secretariat, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, and the International Court of Justice.

The General Assembly is composed of representatives of each of the 122 member nations. According to Article 10 of the U.N. Charter, "The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter," and "may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters." The main feature of the General Assembly is that each member nation is represented on equal footing.

According to the Charter, the primary responsibility for maintenance of world peace and security rests on the Security Council. Although any member of the United Nations may participate in discussions, the Security Council is composed of 10 non-permanent voting members, each with a 2-year term, and five permanent members, each with the power of veto. The Security Council recommends ways of peaceful settlement and may stress actual means of resolution. Investigation of disputes which involves two or more countries are brought to the Council's attention.

Administrative functions are performed by the Secretariat. The Secretary-General, head of the Secretariat, is appointed by the General Assembly with the approval of the Security Council.

Seeking to build security, prosperity, and stability in the world, is the Economic and Social Council. ECOSOC is composed of 27 members who are elected by the General Assembly on a rotation basis.

Entrusted with the administration and supervision of trust territories, the Trusteeship Council is composed of member countries with trust claims, permanent members of the Security Council, and, to insure equality in numbers, other elected members with terms of three years.

The final division of the United Nations is the International Court of Justice, which is the main judicial organ. The Hague in the Netherlands is base for the 15 judges, elected by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Each member state is pledged to comply with the decision of the Court.

A number of specialized agencies are related to the Economic and Social Council. The World Health Organization (WHO), International Labor Organization (ILO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are a few such functions. Each of these agencies aims to improve economic, social, and cultural conditions in the world and members of these agencies do not have to be members of the U.N. The World Health Organization, for example, encourages the membership of all nations of the world.

Conflicts among nations are referred to the United Nations only after the countries themselves fail to solve the problem. Nations are encouraged to settle disputes among themselves.

Three types of disputes come before the organs of the United Nations. Issues of fact include those on which nations are in disagreement over what has happened. Issues of law are those in which parties maintain that legal rights and duties are involved. Finally, issues of policy involve parties who pursue policies that clash.

The most common method of dealing with disputes is diplomacy, often called negotiation. Other forms of diplomacy are media-

tion, in which a third party enters the dispute and suggests solutions, and conciliation which is almost identical to mediation. Often mediation is done by one person representing a state or international organization while conciliation is done by a commission. In both mediation and conciliation, the primary purpose is to find an agreeable solution. Arbitration and judicial settlement are processes of solution which emphasize the application of international law by judges.

When a dispute which cannot be resolved by the countries involved arises, it is brought to either the Security Council or the General Assembly where the issue is placed on the agenda and becomes a subject for debate. Its placement on the agenda is influenced by the urgency of the situation. A problem such as an internal struggle for the possession of territory would naturally be superseded by a problem causing immediate danger of war between nations.

An outstanding feature of all bodies is the free and open debate, which clarifies the issues involved in the controversy.

One prevailing danger is the exchange of propaganda to such a point where misinterpretation of the actual issue occurs.

Handicapping decision making are the lack of communication and the lack of authority to make decisions. Misinterpretation of phrases often leads to opposition which would normally be support. No one organ of the United Nations has actual power to make and enforce a final decision. Recommendations are often ignored rather than heeded.

The Security Council was originally meant to be the decision-making body of the United Nations, but due to the problem of veto, the General Assembly has replaced the Security Council as chief decision making body. One veto by a permanent Security Council member paralyzes the entire legislation under consideration. Therefore, the decision making of the Security Council is under a constant threat of blockage.

The most important feature of decision making at the United Nations is the fact that any member nation as well as any non-member nation may bring disputes or situations to the Security Council or to the General Assembly for consideration.

The United Nations is a meeting place for representatives of all nations—rich, poor, strong, weak—where all opinions are freely expressed and heard.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, without losing his right to the floor, so I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. TRADE POLICY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, during the past 3 years the national economy has reached new levels of output and employment. This has not occurred without strain and disequilibrium, notably in the money market and building industry. In the first half of 1967, there was pause for readjustment after the excess demand of 1966. Now indicators again show signs of upturn ahead, and the statements of businessmen and economists reflect this economic momentum. There have been troublespots. Inflation in 1966 was a serious problem. Now again it is becoming serious as the natural result of excessive stimulation of the economy in part due to unsound fiscal policy measures. I would expect injection to be in the neighborhood of $4\frac{1}{2}$ percent during the next several months, as it has been running at that level for the last three months.

At a time of economic upturn it is regrettable that we find a wide range of industries seeking special measures designed to interrupt the normal operation of the marketplace and create special economic terms for some industries at the expense of others. These forces, latent in any economy, show surprising strength at present. Almost 90 percent of the Members of this body, and an equally large proportion in the House, have introduced bills proposing import controls, mainly quotas.

A quota is a particularly insidious form of trade protection. It is, in effect, a thinly disguised subsidy, the cost of which is impossible to calculate. It provides a position for its beneficiary, insulated from more efficient market sources of competition. Like other gratuitous privileges, the conferral of one quota—or even its prospect—produces a host of other would-be claimants for equal privilege.

Last week the Senate Finance Committee conducted limited hearings on a wide variety of quota bills. The number of restrictive trade measures introduced is no doubt a historic high water mark. In some cases there may actually be problems stemming from imports; in such cases congressional action may be required. Certainly in all cases the Congress owes an obligation to industry to examine its problems thoroughly and fairly, to seek the underlying causes of any maladjustment, and to enact appropriate relief measures.

But at the present moment studied and fair congressional action is impossible. No parliamentary body could responsibly deal with special claims being made by each of the industries in question in the time remaining in the present session. Each is a case of great complexity. Each requires and deserves special study. In each case, the solutions could well be different. And they might have nothing to do with imports.

Lumping the many quota and other restrictive trade bills into one package, and devising a mathematical approach that would cover all trade to try to achieve "orderly" or "stable" marketing of imported products, would be even less responsible. The effect of such action

would be far more serious than the mere total of its parts.

BACKGROUND: U.S. TRADE POLICY

There are many factors that make the present circumstance unique—factors that require the careful attention of us all. One of these factors is the history of the U.S. trade policy.

Congress last legislated tariff rates or restrictive measures for imports in the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, a bill that helped introduce a period of world economic decline. Smoot-Hawley proved that Congress should not legislate tariff rates, or indeed, legislate special measures for any single commodity. And with only a few exceptions; namely, the meat quota bill of 1963, Congress has refrained from doing so. Instead, our national policy has been to remove gradually the border restraints on trade on a reciprocal basis. Authority to do so has been granted to the Executive by the Congress in successive legislation since 1934. Since then Congress has provided the legal and procedural framework in which tariff adjustment should take place, but it has not made such adjustments itself.

Now this long standing principle of U.S. foreign economic policy is being challenged. The challenge cannot be treated lightly or hastily. These are matters of great complexity. Quotas are an extraordinary form of protection from imports. Not even their advocates deny this. For the world's leading exponent of the free-enterprise system to invoke on a wholesale basis a protective device which so profoundly negates the free-market system and the history of U.S. international economic policy should require both a highly unusual set of circumstances, and a reasoned rejection of other remedies. Neither requirement has been met.

CONSUMER ISSUES

Certainly the Congress if it enacts such quota measures will be called to account by the consumer, and rightly so. The consumer will want to know why such an inflationary program is considered at a time when the economy needs the counterinflationary effect of imports. He will want to know why he is called on to pay more for a wide variety of staple products, as well as luxuries. He will want to know why he should have less goods to choose from because of import restraints. He will want to know why certain industries tell their stockholders how good business is with one voice and with another ask the Government to protect them from the same competition that has led to innovations and technological improvement in other industries.

Anyone from Chicago knows that protection is often a racket, and that it is very expensive to the victims. In this case every consumer will be a victim.

Who is the consumer? We all are. And when angered we comprise the most powerful, if somewhat disorganized, lobby in the Nation.

One group of consumers buys finished goods for home, office, or industry consumption.

A second group of consumers buys raw materials and machinery for industrial

uses—as inputs for the production of final products. Higher material costs for this consumer must be reflected in higher prices to his customers.

Both groups of consumers will pay the cost of quota legislation. Take for instance just one luxury item such as mink. The consumer should know she would suffer from mink quotas by paying substantially higher prices. Foreign imports of mink pelts have reduced the price of a mink jacket from \$700 to \$540, hardly an average housewife consumer item, but coming down into a much broader based market. Prices during 1967 have fallen sharply and there will no doubt be some upward adjustment of prices as Scandinavian producers modify their overproduction. But whatever the cause of the price drop, and however long its duration, the consumer clearly benefits.

How about the consumer of rugs? The textile industry, with the backing of fully 50 Senators, recently fought off a reduction in the duty on wilton and velvet carpets and the industry has opposed for years any type of tariff reduction on any textile product, rugs as well as shirts, sheets as well as stockings and tweeds. Indeed, it is in the vanguard in fighting for stricter quotas on all types of man-made fibers and wool, and stricter quotas on cotton textiles.

Does it not seem ironic that the rug industry cries out in alarm for quotas while doing much better than ever before? Note the following quotation in the Fairchild publication, Home Furnishings Daily, of October 16:

Who says you can't see the forest for the trees?

Not carpet manufacturers who are really shouting "timber" these days as they watch their sales acorns grow into mighty oaks.

And they expect sales to sprout even more rapidly during the next few months . . . blossoming into lush green foliage by January floor covering market time.

Let me again pose the question on behalf of the consumer: are special import measures for rugs and carpets and their component fibers really necessary? It appears not. Does the industry profit and the consumer pay? It appears so.

Quotas have been requested for synthetic fibers, simply because in the last half of 1966 overcapacity and sudden new imports of synthetics caused American fiber producers to reduce prices. To many this seemed an adjustment process. To most of us this is elementary economics. To the manmade fiber manufacturers, however, those price decreases meant a strong new impetus to join forces with their cotton and wool textile colleagues to seek comprehensive quotas now contained in S. 1796, sponsored by over 65 Senators.

The consumer should know whether this restrictive trade policy for textiles is justified. Is it justified, for example, in terms of a recent report in the Daily News Record of September 19, which said:

One thing fiber men are unanimous about: Business is better, prices are firmer, and everyone is much more optimistic than just a few months ago.

The consumer should also know whether a restrictive quota bill for foot-

wear imports is necessary. Such a bill is S. 2540 introduced by nine Members of this body. A cursory analysis of import data would indicate that the problem is not as presented by some. Imports of shoes and slippers in 1966 totaled 43.3 million pairs and were equal to only 13.7 percent of domestic production of fully 316.6 million pairs.

Price information makes these figures more meaningful. The average price of the shoes imported during the last half of 1966 was \$1.85, but the average price of the U.S. shoe was \$4.25. On analysis another factor becomes clear. The cheap imported shoes do not compete with the more expensive U.S. shoes. They are of a different type. For example, 48 percent of all imports of shoes and slippers in 1966 were novelty items like women's boots and rainwear.

Again, let us ask ourselves some questions as representatives of America's consumers: Is it in the consumer's best interest to cut off imports of low-cost shoes? Is it to the consumer's best interest to want to maintain a fixed relationship between imports and domestic production of shoes? No. What is this concept of "stable and orderly" markets? It makes as much sense economically as restricting the new car customer to his nearest franchised dealer.

What about the other type of consumer: the businessman who needs lower cost raw materials such as steel, and petroleum? Steel imports from Western Europe are estimated to save this American consumer \$19.80 per ton, and steel imports from Japan are estimated to save him about \$35 a ton. Meantime the domestic steel industry is increasingly productive, and production is being absorbed by the domestic market.

Here is what the president of an independent small steel company has written to me:

Since principal producers of the (raw product) also produce the (finished product) you can see that they not only control the disposition, but they control the prices we independents must pay for our raw material and at the same time fix the prices which we can sell our finished product for. They have seen fit to maintain the same basic spread between (the two prices) that existed in 1957. Twice in the last five years they have raised the price of the raw product . . . thereby increasing their profits, . . . without allowing an independent producer any price increase at all . . . As a result of this pricing, independents, like ourselves, were forced to turn to some foreign sources to get some relief from our rising costs, so that is why I say that by their pricing practices and domestic distribution practices the large producers have contributed to a large extent to the need for foreign steel.

The steel case is a very complicated one, and I will not oversimplify it here. But I wish again to point out that before acting on such a complex matter, the Senate and House have the obligation to find meaningful answers to these questions.

S. 2332, the oil import bill which received brief consideration in committee last week, would freeze into statute the present administrative quota on petroleum imports into the United States east of the Rockies at a level not to exceed 12.2 percent of U.S. production of crude

petroleum and natural gas liquids in this area. And it would in other ways close the market to imported crude oil and petroleum products.

Seemingly advantageous from the point of view of the independent American oil producer, this quota program would be disadvantageous to the chemical companies that consume the derivatives of oil in making petrochemical products for sale to industry here and abroad. The domestic supply of such petroleum raw materials, called feedstocks, cannot be increased by use of heavier liquids from crudes because they have been made, the chemical industry claims, prohibitively expensive from a competitive standpoint by the oil import program. In contrast to the situation in the United States, foreign chemical producers have unrestricted access to petroleum feedstocks at lower prices, prices not determined by an artificial quota program.

These examples demonstrate that the quota bills before us must be individually studied. They are all complex, all different. In each case, I ask that my colleagues in the Senate and my former colleagues in the business world to ask themselves one fundamental question: Are imports only an excuse for your other real economic problems?

I have described why the present restrictive trade movement seems to me to be unique in terms of the history of U.S. commercial policy. I have described why the national interest is at stake. I have described why the consumer interest is paramount.

There are still other implications that I must emphasize.

FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES ENDANGERED

A critical aspect of the enactment of these measures would be their effect on our foreign policy.

At the moment we are fighting a difficult and costly war. There are aspects of this involvement about which many Americans have profound doubts. But an important element of our policy is to maintain all possible support for our position in Vietnam by the world's free nations.

Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Republic of China and many other countries have made contributions of men and materials to support this cause. Leadership in countries like Great Britain, in spite of potent domestic pressure, continue to accept our involvement in Vietnam.

But how long could we expect certain countries whose support is even now subject to internal pressure to continue to support us were we to take unilateral action to disrupt their economic well-being?

No member of the business, labor, or agricultural communities should forget that foreign economic policy and foreign policy go hand in hand. The objective of each policy must be to establish and to maintain world stability and prosperity. That these objectives are threatened by the pending legislation should be plain and clear.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

By the magnitude of its economic strength the United States dominates

free world affairs. We have attempted to use this responsibility for leadership wisely, through multilateral action among all free world nations. In creating an ever more peaceful free world community we create a tremendous magnetic field to which the more stagnant, less creative Communist bloc countries are inevitably attracted.

It was multilateral action which recently resulted in the greatest international trade negotiation ever consummated—the Kennedy round. In the fields of disarmament, balance-of-payments adjustment, international monetary policy, and less visible but equally important areas, the U.S. responsibly exercises its leadership in a community of nations. After 35 years of progress, to regress to unilateral action would be an admission of defeat by American business. I cannot believe that the business community in which I have lived and worked for over a quarter of a century is willing to make such an admission.

As a former industrialist who has faced the sometimes crushing problems of stiff import competition from Japan and Germany particularly, my associates and I also faced the decision: should we ask for protection from foreign competition or fight for our markets, here and abroad? We answered that question and chose the marketplace. The results over the past decade illustrate very well that such a decision not only served the Nation, the industry, and our company, but the consumer as well.

Mr. President, during the years I have testified before the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. I became deeply impressed with certain Members of Congress who seemed to have a firm grasp upon the economics involved in trade, recognizing that trade is a two-way street, that we cannot send our ships loaded with American products abroad and bring them back empty, because we are unwilling to buy from abroad. There have been some Senators and Representatives who have known that the American eagle on a dollar could really be a homing pigeon, and that there is no place that that American dollar can ultimately be spent rather than back here in the United States of America.

Two Members of Congress in particular have been, in my mind, outstanding: In the House of Representatives, Tom CURTIS, of Missouri—a scholar, a student, a dedicated disciple of good, sound economics and sound fiscal policy, a practical, hardheaded, realistic conservative who seeks to conserve what he believes is the strength of American enterprise by speaking on behalf of this country as a great exporting country as well as a great importing country, fighting for the employment of a fiscal soundness and integrity in our business system which says, "We believe in the free market"—has sought to protect that free market as a public office holder.

In the Senate, we have the senior Senator from New York, Senator JACK JAVITS, whose voice has been heard through the years speaking on behalf of sound fiscal policy. He is generally looked upon and regarded as a liberal, but his policies as

a businessman I know to be in the essence of conservatism, seeking to conserve those basic factors of our free enterprise system that are our underlying strength. The strength of our country is not based upon tariffs or barriers that exist in this country or any other country; and Senator JAVITS has been realistic in recognizing that the strength of this country is in the freedom of its economy; and he believes in freedom of economy in all countries, to strengthen and maintain the free world.

The efforts and achievements of five administrations in this field of foreign economic trade policy are threatened. They must be defended. This is the immediate battle. And after this one is fought we must turn our attention to the true fiscal causes of the current protectionist campaign. Imports cannot be an excuse for failing to confront the underlying economic problems before us.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, speaking personally, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind words about me. He is gracious and generous, and I appreciate his statement very much. As befits a friend, perhaps he overstates my role, but nevertheless I appreciate his comments greatly. I know that Representative Tom CURTIS—also a very good friend of mine and Senator PERCY's, who serves with us on the Joint Economic Committee—would want me to express appreciation in his behalf also.

As to the merits of the situation, I know of no greater ally in this struggle—which is a very difficult one for Senators and Representatives to wage—than the Senator from Illinois. He comes fresh from the business world, and practices what he preaches. When he was a businessman, he came here repeatedly opposing protectionist policies, which would theoretically have helped Bell & Howell, his company—because he was sure that in the final analysis they would not; and his belief has proved to be correct. This is an important lesson for all American business leaders.

We circularized a great part of American business in connection with our hearings on these matters before the Committee on Finance, and received a great many telegrams and other responses from business supporting the position the Senator from Illinois and I have taken. Quite apart from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, and in a separate place in the RECORD, to follow his remarks and this colloquy, I ask unanimous consent that telegrams and letters from the chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co., from the executive vice president for international banking of the Bank of America, from the chairman and president of International Packers, Limited; from the chairman of the Winton Co.; from the president of Xerox Corp.; from president of Crown Zellerbach Corp.; from the president of the United Aircraft Corp.; from the vice president of Honeywell; from the chairman of the executive committee of Gillette Co.; from the president of Motorola Co.; the telegram of the U.S. Council of

the International Chamber of Commerce to Chairman LONG of the Finance Committee, and wires from other companies and representatives having the same position, be printed in the RECORD, together with some samples which I shall introduce of an enormous body of editorial comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Now, Mr. President, by way of direct comment upon the Senator's position, I think that it should be made known to the country that the people who take the position Senator PERCY and I take and Representative Tom CURTIS takes, are looking, to the interests of our whole Nation, and are really seeking to achieve what is in the best hardheaded financial interests of our Nation, rather than adopting some eleemosynary or charitable point of view that we want to build up other nations—a position which I would not take, nor would Senator PERCY, I am sure.

So I ask the Senator a specific question. I note with great interest a sentence at page 10 of his prepared remarks, which reads:

After 35 years of progress, to regress to unilateral action would be an admission of defeat by American business.

I ask the Senator from Illinois for his view as to whether that statement could not be amended to read that American business would, if a protectionist policy were adopted in this country, lose enormous sources of income, enormous sources of profit, and enormous opportunities for development, advancement, and future investment?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I certainly would accept that amendment. There is no question the losses the gentleman has mentioned would certainly occur. I appreciate the opportunity to expand on that sentence. First of all, it would be an admission by Congress, if we were to agree to the array of quotas being requested, that this is not a consumer's economy, but a producer's economy, and that our job is to protect the producer and not to protect the consumer.

If that is true, then I have lived my whole business life wrong. I have always envisioned my responsibility as a businessman as being to serve the interest of this country and put my company behind the country and adhere to a position that is best economically as well as politically for the country and for the consumer.

It would be a defeat if we were to protect ourselves from what I feel are the tremendous advantages we would have in new ideas and new products coming from abroad.

Consider the automobile industry. That is one industry that has grown stronger and more vigorous because of its advocating freer trade. They have in good conscience advocated such a position because it is good for their industry and for the country.

They do not necessarily like all the competition coming in from Germany and Japan. No businessman seeks competition. But they have all admitted that this kind of competition—small cars and new features built into them—has

been a stimulant to their own design departments. They have also recognized that when our supplies were shut down at a time of steel strikes, they could not have continued to keep going without the import of steel from abroad. And, I might add, it is partly as a result of shutdowns in the steel industry, that there has been brought about a reliance by industry on imported steel.

They recognize that it is a good thing to have imports of other products and other materials. There has been the development of the use of fibers and aluminum so that they might have substitute materials for the automobile industry.

It would be a tragic defeat for one of the greatest industries of the country if we were to slide behind a wall of protectionism.

We know that foreign countries are more ingenious in finding ways to inhibit trade. The Senator from New York knows better than anybody else that foreign countries are most ingenious, and have imposed on American industry quotas, embargoes, hidden types of taxes, variable import levies, and certain tax policies which have discriminated against us.

We have the job of fighting to remove these hidden barriers. What chance would we have if we were to accept defeat in this area and hide behind the protectionist wall and then try to remove the other barriers discriminating against American products?

It would be a tragic defeat to take this backward step and revise a policy which has experienced 35 years of forward momentum.

Mr. JAVITS. I gather that the Senator is not urging a complete removal of the U.S. tariff structure insofar as we do retain tariffs and do have the Tariff Commission hearings relating to findings of fact or serious injury, the national defense safeguards, and the other safeguards in our law through which we have made enormous progress as evidenced from the Kennedy round and the general reduction of tariffs in the world.

The Senator is not trying to make a case for the complete dismantling of that structure?

Mr. PERCY. Certainly not. That is why I used the words "freer trade" instead of "free trade." The world is not ready to accept free trade, and neither are we. There are provisions in the law to provide protection for hardship cases. But here we have had a wave of requested restrictions which, if all the bills were enacted into law, would restrict imports to the extent of half of the imports into the country.

We are trying to work within that framework and not try to impose an impossible structure for us to work under in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the United States runs a substantially affirmative trade balance. We export merchandise which exceeds in value the merchandise that we import by between \$4 and \$5 billion a year.

Does the Senator regard it as a fair statement to say also that we do run—as the Senator knows, and as we all know—a very affirmative balance in

terms of the return on our investments abroad—roughly in the area of \$5 billion to \$6 billion a year. And does the Senator feel that the pattern of such investments would be materially and adversely affected by a protectionist position which the United States would assume if it were to adopt a quota system such as we have discussed?

Mr. PERCY. There is little doubt of that. Our favorable balance of trade amounts to almost \$4 billion at this time, and our balance of payments is highly dependent upon this favorable balance of trade.

If I may give the Senator an illustration of what would happen, I had a conversation a few evenings ago with an Ambassador from a country that is vital in their relationship to the United States. We are highly dependent upon them for certain products.

This Ambassador indicated to me that his country had an unfavorable balance amounting to several hundreds of millions of dollars in trade with the United States—they buy them from us then we sell to them.

He said that we would within 30 days turn the screws on that and shut us off. He further said that they hold hundreds of millions of dollars which they have the right to turn in for gold. And he said: "Even though we are friends of the United States, if your country does that to us, we will show you the economic power we have to retaliate. We will embarrass the U.S. Treasury by demanding gold for the dollars we hold now."

The whole rippling effect would spread across this country. There is no question that we would be retaliated against, and the favorable balance of trade we now enjoy would very quickly and seriously be eroded.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator, I gather, would favor any kind of enlightened reform—and I think some reform is necessary—of the trade adjustment provision of the Trade Expansion Act, so that anyone who is really harmed could, more feasibly than possible under the present statute, get some relief and compensation.

The present law is quite restrictive on that score. I have urged—and I hope very much the Senator can give this some consideration—the Finance Committee in dealing with the whole question to liberalize the adjustment assistance aspect of the present law.

How would the Senator feel about that?

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter that I wrote to the Secretary of Labor this spring specifically to the point that the distinguished Senator from New York has raised.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1967.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is my understanding that in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the Automotive Parts

Trade Act of 1965, you indicated that the Administration was considering submitting a bill to Congress revising the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

As you know, the adjustment assistance program has been virtually inoperative since its inception. At the same time, the adjustment assistance provisions of the Automotive Parts Trade Act included criteria for eligibility that are much more generous than provided under the Trade Expansion Act. I believe that the Tariff Commission has certified an eligible seven groups of workers to date, that one application has been denied, and that six are still pending.

The special treatment granted under the Automotive Parts Trade Act seems to me highly inequitable, and I would hope that the Administration would send a bill to the Congress liberalizing the adjustment features of the Trade Expansion Act at the earliest possible time. The completion of the Kennedy Round lends particular urgency to this problem.

It is my understanding that the Administration has tentatively agreed on a draft bill. I would appreciate very much knowing whether this is the case, and, if so, when we can expect the bill to be sent up.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PERCY. There is no question that industries and workers damaged by imports from past tariff reductions, as well as those under the Kennedy round, will require some form of adjustment aid. We have accepted this as a matter of principle in Congress, though I feel that we must take care to integrate closely such measures for trade adjustment with other measures that we have in the laws to help workers adjust to continually changing economic conditions.

When I worked for the 1962 enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Act, I discussed with President Kennedy, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor my feelings that industry would need support and help in this area just as employees who might be adversely affected require adjustment.

I wholeheartedly supported this aspect, and I have asked the administration whether they are fully implementing and using the powers available to them under this law to provide for assistance to companies that are more adversely affected by imports than others.

There was never a law to provide for help for a company that was manufacturing iceboxes and was put out of business because of the technological development of electrical refrigerators. That problem went through the normal course of adjustment.

I hope that American industry and labor unions will not abuse the privilege of Congress as written into this act. However, there has been a wise provision incorporated in the law, if the provision is wisely administered. The point made by the distinguished Senator from New York is well taken. We must update and liberalize this assistance as we continue to update and liberalize our trade policies.

Mr. JAVITS. Finally, I should like to ask this of the Senator: Many netting nontariff barriers to trade continue in effect in certain countries which are important trading partners for us. There

are road taxes, for example, which are expressly operated so that they actually discriminate against American automobile exports. Will the Senator give his opinion as to whether he believes we can do more or less in dealing with those nontariff barriers by legislating in these quotas. Or, does he believe it is likely to work in reverse, and if we put these quotas into effect, we will find it even more difficult and we will get many more tariff barriers than we now have?

Mr. PERCY. If we put these quotas on the variety of products such as has now been proposed—from steel to strawberries, from zinc to mink—I would say that not only would we be hypocrites to the world, but also, we would have destroyed every possibility that this administration has in the hard bargaining that it is carrying on, under the able leadership of Ambassador Roth, with a firm policy supported by the President and by every Cabinet officer—we would have destroyed their ability to remove the remaining barriers which exist against American exports.

Certainly, the distinguished senior Senator from New York knows that in his own State, in manufactured products worth 1,807,000,000 was exported in 1966, which is a 29-percent increase over 1963 and substantially more than that over previous years. So there is a general trend upward.

Employment in New York State and in virtually every State in the Union is dependent upon our ability to keep exports flowing abroad. The removal of the remaining hidden restrictions is the most important single function this administration can now perform in the bargaining process. We, in Congress, would be responsible for destroying the bargaining power to open up the trade lanes of the world to American products if we imposed this array of tariff quotas and restrictions.

Mr. JAVITS. This leads me to my last question: How would the Senator read such action, which would be widely interpreted in the world as protectionist in terms of the U.S. posture generally? Does he believe that the world would take this as a signal of an enormous reversal in American policy of withdrawal from the world, an insulated fortress America? Does he believe that such action could have enormously portentous consequences in terms of the adherence of various nations to the Soviet bloc rather than to the free world, it still being a fact, notwithstanding all our troubles, that the great preponderance of mankind—not only in resources but also in territory, in population, and in production—is still ranged on the side of what is called the free world?

Mr. PERCY. I cannot imagine anything that would cause greater joy in the Kremlin or in Peking or in Havana than a policy of restrictive quotas on products coming from abroad, to stop the flow of two-way trade between the United States and nations all over the world with which it now deals.

Through the centuries, political friendships have tended to follow the trade lanes; and the great strength of this country lies in the economic strength we have. This economic strength in the

free enterprise system has made this, over a period of years, the most powerful nation on earth, has made us the wealthiest people on earth, and has enabled us to be the most generous people on earth.

But we would be saying to the rest of the world that this great, powerful enterprise and these powerful companies which are here clamoring for quota protection now no longer have faith, no longer are leading from courage, but are leading from fear—fearful that they cannot trade economically with the rest of the world, fearful that we cannot survive on the battlefield of trade, which has been the century-long battlefield in which we have invariably been successful, effectively made friends throughout the world and benefited our own people, as well as people of other countries.

What are we saying to the world—that we will aid you, we will give you gifts, but we will not trade with you? The very countries we are now assisting through our foreign aid program are the ones whose economic development depends most on the ability to wean themselves from aid by trade with the United States. Those would be the countries we would be affecting most adversely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has given one of the most eloquent demonstrations in his career as to why the people of the State of Illinois sent him to Congress as their Senator; also, in my judgment, why the entire country is glad that the people of Illinois did.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. PERCY. I thank my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York.

EXHIBIT I

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 20, 1967.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to commend you for your ardent opposition to the import quota legislation now before the Congress. I have always believed in the minimum of restriction being imposed on imports and exports as a means to maximum international trade and encouraging good will and understanding between nations. Keep up the good work.

JACK I. STRAUS,
Chairman of the Board,
R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
October 21, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

While recognizing that foreign countries continue to discriminate against many U.S. products we support the general principle of free trade as essential to future world trade expansion and hence your general position opposing import quota legislation before Congress.

ROLAND PIEROTTI,
Executive Vice President, International Banking, Bank of America.

CXIII—1900—Part 22

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I congratulate you on your forthright opposition to pending import quota legislation both in your effective testimony before the Senate Finance Committee yesterday and in your remarks from the Senate floor on a number of occasions. It is unfortunate that more Members of Congress do not recognize as you do that the foreign trade of your nation would be seriously jeopardized if the protectionist principles embodied in these quota bills were allowed to prevail. I trust you will continue to be a leader in the fight to avoid this threatened reversal of U.S. trade policy, the inevitable effect of which would be to penalize the consumer through higher prices and to ensure retaliation on the part of other countries.

A. THOMAS TAYLOR,
Chairman and President,
International Packers, Ltd.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very well impressed with your testimony before Senate Finance Committee on restrictive legislation. If such legislation were enacted we would start turning back to the Smoot Hawley days of retaliation and depression and also increase cost of living in this country. Heartily approve your position. With best wishes.

DAVID J. WINTON,
Chairman, the Winton Co.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
October 23, 1967.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly endorse your testimony Oct. 19 before Senate Finance Committee concerning import quota legislation. We hope these enlightened views prevail.

JOSEPH C. WILSON,
President, Xerox Corp.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
October 32, 1967.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support position you took before Senate Finance Committee on import quota legislation.

G. H. GALLAWAY,
President, Crown Zellerbach International, Inc.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
October 28, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been informed of your testimony before the Senate Finance Committee opposing import quota legislation. This is to let you know that I strongly support your position in this matter and appreciate your willingness to testify in opposition to the pending legislation.

E. W. SPENCER,
Member, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Vice President, Honeywell, Inc.

EAST HARTFORD, CONN.,
October 28, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to voice strong agreement with your testimony before Senate Finance Committee.

Completely concur in your opposition to any proposed bills establishing import quotas. Such legislation would lead to retaliation by nations comprising our export market. Any retaliatory action could jeopardize the present one hundred million dollar annual export business volume of this corporation and thus adversely affect the economic level of not only our immediate locale in Florida and Connecticut but also of the whole New England area in which we are largest single employer.

W. P. GWINN,
President, United Aircraft Corp.

TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: We heartily applaud and commend you for your strong opposition to import quota legislation as set forth in your testimony yesterday before the Senate Finance Committee.

Tobacco is extremely sensitive to any restriction on imports as our exports account for a sizable percentage of the total amount of tobacco grown in this country. In the case of flue-cured which accounts for about half of our total production, exports run from 30 to 40 percent annually and are thus of vital importance to growers of this type in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida.

Attached is a statement which we filed with the committee on October 18th.

Very sincerely yours,
JNO. D. PALMER,
President.

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. PALMER, PRESIDENT, TOBACCO ASSOCIATES, INC., TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE IN THE MATTER OF IMPORT QUOTA LEGISLATION, OCTOBER 18, 1967

For more than three centuries and without interruption, exports of unmanufactured tobacco from this country have played a leading and vital role in the wellbeing of our economy. These are the facts as of today:

1. Exports in the fiscal year ended June 30 exceeded 700 million pounds, farm weight, with a value of \$505 million.
2. Of that value, 79% represented cash sales and thus contributed nearly \$400 million to our balance of payments.
3. Of the shipped weight, more than 31% went to the European Common Market.

America exports because it imports—exports tobacco and all the other commodities and products that add up to the \$29.4 billion in calendar 1966. In the hands of Congress, or about to be introduced, are proposals that would build a wall against imports. That same wall would even more effectively shut off our trade overseas.

As far as tobacco itself is involved, here are the cold facts with respect to one area alone, the European Common Market which, as noted above, takes nearly a third of our exports. Before the Council of Ministers today are proposals by the Common Market Commission for an agricultural policy covering tobacco. In substance, that proposal would encourage increased production in the Community by high price support payments; and, when supplies of such tobacco reached surplus levels, imports would be reduced or cut off entirely under an import licensing system. Today, tobacco manufacturers in the Community are entirely at liberty to buy from third countries free of any form of restriction either as to quantities or values. Carried to the extreme, the Commission proposal could mean the loss of a market worth far in excess of \$100 million annually to the American farmer. Thus far, the Council has not accepted the proposal, but let there be no doubt that restrictions by the Congress on imports would provide both a reason and an excuse to make it op-

erative. By extension, retaliatory action in one form or another would inevitably occur in all other major markets overseas.

Let there also be no doubt on this point. While America is still the world's largest producer of tobacco, the world is not—I repeat not—dependent upon our crop. In every part of the globe—in South America, Africa, Eastern Europe and the Far East—production has been expanded enormously. In flue-cured, the principal component of cigarettes, production abroad has spiraled from less than 500 million pounds annually prior to World War II to five times that figure in 1966. It can easily and quickly expand to the point that American tobacco will no longer be needed. Mark you well that the tobacco industries of West Germany and Japan, our second and third largest customers today, were without our product all during the war years. It took a monumental effort to rebuild both markets. Unwise, unnecessary and unrealistic tariff walls on our part will cause them only superficial, temporary inconvenience. For the American farmer, the result could be irreparable damage.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 19, 1967.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully endorsed what you said to the Senate Finance Committee on October 19th. Enactment of import restriction bill now before the Senate would severely damage our trade achievement and the total national interest. Reports that the bill stand fair chance of being passed have all ready brought discredit to U.S. policy, creditability and to the Congress itself. I urge you to continue your effort to save the Senate from the falling of some of its own members.

CARL J. GILBERT,
Executive Committee, Gillette Co.

U.S. COUNCIL REGISTERS OPPOSITION TO IMPORT QUOTAS LEGISLATION

NEW YORK, October 18.—The United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce today sent the following telegram to Senator Russell B. Long, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

The Council statement was directed to hearings currently being held by the Finance Committee on several bills to impose import quotas on various commodities.

Representing some 300 major American companies engaged in international business, the Council statement strongly opposed enactment of these bills.

TELEGRAM FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE FOR FINANCE

"U.S. Council of International Chamber of Commerce strongly opposed to import quota legislation now before your committee. At deliberations today undersigned members executive committee unanimously agreed this legislation could serve only to reverse thirty years trade policy progress. Our country now stands to lose incalculable benefits of enlightened bi-partisan efforts to modernize world's commercial structure. Imposition of quotas will lead to retaliation from other countries. They would have no choice but to follow our example with world-wide restrictive chain reaction bound to result. This neither U.S. nor world can afford. Export earnings vital to balance of payments would be in jeopardy. Higher costs induced by quotas would add to inflationary pressures. The sacrifice of jobs generated by trade would deepen unemployment problems. Damaging effect of proposed quotas on overall policy position would be enormous. In terms of our national interest dangers are

overwhelming. Major U.S. stake in world production structure would be imperiled. We have consistently urged upon other nations the benefits of free competition. We must practice it ourselves.

Chairman Executive Committee: James A. Linen, Time, Inc.; William Blackie, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; Max E. Gevers, Bankers Trust Co.; Patrick E. Haggerty, Texas Instrument, Inc.; H. J. Heinz II, H. J. Heinz, Co.; Walter Hochschild, American Metal Climax, Inc.; Amory Houghton, Corning Glass Works; Antonio T. Knoppers, Merck Sharp & Dohme International; Warren Lee Pierson, All American Cable & Radio, Inc.; Philip D. Reed, Former Chairman, General Electric Co.; Ralph T. Reed, Former Chairman, American Express; Hoyt P. Steele, General Electric Co.; Arthur K. Watson, International Business Machines Corp.; Leo D. Welch, Former Chairman, Standard Oil Co. (N.J.); Walter Wriston, First National City Bank; U.S. Council, Christopher H. Phillips, President.

MOTOROLA INC.,
October 17, 1967.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: On September 29, 1967, Senator Russell B. Long (D., La.), Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, announced that the Committee would hold three days of public hearings beginning October 18 on various proposals to impose import quotas on specified commodities. Among the commodities on which Chairman Long indicated testimony would be taken were oil, meat, lead and zinc, textiles, steel and dairy products. An article on page 3 of the Wall Street Journal for October 11, 1967, also mentions electronic products. The purpose of this letter is to advise you of Motorola's strong opposition to import quotas on electronic products.

In view of our plant at Arcade, New York, you might think we favor import quotas to gain protection from foreign firms whose wage costs are lower. On the contrary, we feel that our long run national interest is best preserved by less restrictive international trade. Our experience as an importer indicates to us that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to administer import quotas in an industry with such a wide variety of products. We also export many products made in the United States, and we fear that American import quotas would quickly bring retaliation abroad. In the United States consumers would be paying higher prices if we had import quotas. Inflation is already very much with us, even without fresh trade restraints to accentuate it. For these reasons we hope you will oppose any attempt to put import quotas on electronic products.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

MOTOROLA INC.,
LEWIS D. SPENCER,
Vice President.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
October 23, 1967.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Rochester-Monroe County port authority is strongly opposed to import quota bills now being considered. Enactment of these bills would result in punitive restrictions against U.S. export sale and bring serious description if not strangulation of foreign trade. We respectfully urge your opposition to these measures.

ARNOLD B. MORRISON,
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
October 19, 1967.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Finance Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following port members of the council of Lake Erie ports strongly oppose pending bill to impose import quotas and restrictions on selected products as an immediate incentive to sharp retaliation by foreign governments and thus an imminent threat to all people engaged in any aspect of world trade. Congress should know that this country is the world's leading exporter in spite of high wages and that universally it is modern machinery and advanced methods rather than hourly rates which determine whether domestic industry is competitive in the world market. Proponents of restrictions need better management not additional protection ports. Joining in this message are Ashtabula, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Erie, Fairport Harbor, Lorain and Toledo.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR W. TODD,
Secretary, Lincoln Electric Co.

UNITED STATES WARNED OF REPRISALS BY COMMAIT

(By Gordon L. Weil)

BRUSSELS, October 13.—The Common Market has given the United States a thinly veiled warning that it will retaliate if protectionist legislation supported by members of congress is enacted.

The six member countries submitted identical notes to the State Department Thursday, complaining against "protectionist tendencies" that may "compromise" the results of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations. The Kennedy Round, begun during President John F. Kennedy's administration and concluded last June, yielded an agreement to lower tariffs around the world.

[In Washington, the State Department said it is "deeply concerned" about the trade bills that may be filed in Congress, United Press International reported.

JOHNSON REMARKS

[Spokesman Robert J. McClosky called attention to remarks made Thursday by President Johnson, who said he believed promoting the expansion of world trade is in America's self-interest.

[McClosky said the State Department's position would be presented more fully at hearings next week before the Senate Finance Committee.]

At the same time the notes were sent, the European Community Commission, the independent executive arm of the Common Market, began studying possible retaliatory measures. Reprisals by the Common Market, the World's largest trading unit and a major American market, could wipe out many of the tariff cuts accepted in June.

The six show most concern over proposals by Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) to boost American protection on textiles and watch movements. The Common Market believes that U.S. textile imports might be cut 37 per cent if such a bill is passed.

Omnibus import-quota proposals supported by Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R-Ill.) also have the Six worried. And they have drawn up a list showing that specific protectionist legislation has been proposed for oil, meat, mink skins, lead and zinc, and strawberries.

Six separate notes—from France, West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, are sent when the Common Market wants to give maximum weight to a message. The Commission itself could have protested to the United States.

The Common Market notes do not mention individual exports, but the Commission is known to be giving top priority to fore-

stalling American action against the "dumping" of European canned hams.

Market officials say privately that American negotiators in the Kennedy round knew of European supports for meat exports when they agreed to cut canned-ham tariffs 30 per cent. Many reciprocal reductions were linked to that agreement.

The Market has considerable flexibility in taking retaliatory action. Legislatures in the six countries have turned over most commerce powers to the executive branch, which in turn has vested them in the Common Market's Council of Ministers. Thus, once the Commission made a proposal, it could be enacted without lengthy hearings.

Tobacco is one of the products for which Common Market protection may be increased if antidumping action is taken against canned-ham imports. In the Kennedy round, the Six made substantial cuts in their duties on high-quality tobaccos, most of which come from the United States.

Much of the legislation to be before Congress would in effect revoke current American practices aimed at promoting freer trade.

A bill proposed by Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.), for example, would remove the President's power to determine when an influx of foreign goods has made emergency protection necessary. Sen. Smith would substitute automatic measures at a certain level of imports.

Concern that American protectionist measures were imminent grew when the Common Market learned of the upcoming Senate Finance Committee hearings. The committee chairman, Sen. Russell B. Long (D-La.), is himself the author of at least one bill, and reports reaching Brussels picture most of the Committee and the Senate as favoring protection.

LATIN AMERICANS LODGE PROTEST

Latin American ambassadors to Washington held an emergency meeting here yesterday to protest bills to limit imports or raise tariffs.

They said any protectionist measure would be a blow to Latin countries' efforts to broaden markets in the United States and speed their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1967]

JAPAN, UNITED STATES APPROACH BATTLE IN TRADE-PROTECTION DISPUTE

(By Richard Halloran)

TOKYO, October 19.—Japan and the United States are on the verge of an all-out economic battle.

The Japanese government, business community, and press have let loose a salvo at the rising protectionist movement in the United States. It came partly in response to American demands that Japan open its economy to foreign private investment.

Yomiuri Shimbun, a leading daily, summed up the Japanese attitude this way: "We must be prepared for the worst and have countermeasures ready for any eventuality."

[The six European Common countries have formally protested the protectionist proposals, hinting retaliation. Australia also has protested, and Latin American and other nations have protested informally.]

The Japanese government announced yesterday that it is preparing plans to reduce American exports to Japan by almost 25 per cent if the U.S. Congress passes a number of bills the Japanese consider protectionist. Among them are acts that would restrict imports of textiles, steel, electronics, rubber footwear.

The government threatened to cut imports from America by \$600 million, out of a total sale last year \$2.6 billion. The Japanese said they would buy meat from Argentina, wheat from Canada and Australia, rice from Korea

and Taiwan. The United States already competes with Communist China for the soybeans.

Japan also delivered a strongly worded note of protest to the U.S. Government this week.

The Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI), which oversees Japan's trade, and U.S. Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge will be invited to Japan later this month while en route to Korea to be informed of their thinking.

Yomiuri Shimbun this morning warned that, as a retaliatory measure, Japan also can postpone proposals to remove stringent restrictions against foreign investment here.

This is likely to hit a very sore point with internationally minded U.S. businessmen. Americans have been demanding for years, with little success, that Japan allow American investments in accordance with the basic U.S.-Japan commercial treaty.

Rudolph A. Peterson, president of the Bank of America, said here recently that Japanese criticism of American legislation while holding back on its own capital liberalization will increase U.S. resistance.

George Ball, former Under Secretary of State, was more blunt. He told Japanese businessmen they could expect greater American resistance to their exports unless they opened up their markets on a reciprocal basis.

[The Canadian government's "serious concern" over the import restriction bills before Congress was voiced in a note to the State Department delivered Tuesday, Gerald Warling reported from Ottawa.

[The note, presented in parliament Thursday, said the imposition of restrictions on imports from Canada would contravene trade agreements between Canada and the United States "and would raise basic questions in (their) trade relations."]

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Oct. 16, 1967]

PASTURES FOR THE SACRED COWS

It is astonishing to find how many people—including many of those presumably dedicated to the concept of free enterprise—are bemused these days with such phrases as "status quo" and "fixed share of the market."

American law, as it applies to American enterprise, finds both phrases abhorrent. They have been long regarded in this country as the slogans of the wicked European cartels of old. And perhaps for a reason. Whenever two or more competitors agree to freeze their prime markets and minimize future competition between them, interlopers with new ideas are kept out, prices are kept up, technological progress sags and the general economy is made to suffer in the interests of greater comfort for the business giants.

But if the status quo is adjudged to be a dangerous kind of sacred cow for business to let out of the barn, what kind of cow does it become when brought forth by governments? And in particular by the United States government?

An alarming number of these cows are now loose on the landscape, all demanding their "fixed share" of the pasture.

They crop up in commodity stabilization agreements, in Brazilian efforts to freeze the carriage of coffee to North American markets and in a seemingly ever-widening range of quotas on imports—all of them dedicated to the proposition that everyone should keep what he has now and that all others are out of luck—a proposition that also has an almost hypnotic appeal to the major labor unions.

The biggest drive in this direction in recent history is now being mounted in Washington, where it is being openly said that import quotas on crude oil, and on cotton, wool and synthetic fibers are not enough.

The next candidates for the near freeze are cited as iron and steel products, glass, footwear, lead and zinc, electronic parts and

such. Not since the political logrolling that produced the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1930 has such a concerted protectionist drive been organized. And to make it all the more intriguing—there are signs that the individual quotas will be slipped into the Social Security Bill as riders, the theory being that while President Johnson would probably veto them all if given the chance, he would think twice about blocking the Social Security changes he has wanted so much.

Now it can be argued, of course, that the quotas would not in all cases have to be inflexible, that some provision can be (and in practice, has been) made for new faces in a particular market, and that it would be simply too embarrassing all around to try raising tariffs now (in lieu of quotas) before the ink on the Kennedy Round is dry.

Perhaps so, but no matter how the cloth is cut, the objective of all these maneuvers, including those embedded in the commodity stabilization agreements, is maintenance of a rough sort of status quo of "fixed share of the market" system—the very system that the courts consider anathema when organized within the United States by private business.

Nor does it make much difference that the system now in vogue does not involve cartels in the old sense of the word, but division of a market by groups of national industries or—to put it another way, that even under a quota system American steel industries would still have to battle each other for the U.S. market and foreign steel producers would have to do likewise.

But the purpose of the import quota system is, after all, to dull the edge of competition by more or less fixing the share of a particular market as between domestic and foreign sellers. If this is considered a "bad practice" when organized by a group of companies on their own, by what sort of medieval alchemy does it suddenly become a "good practice" when given the blessings of a benevolent government?

As between what Congress has already sanctioned in the way of share-of-the-market import quotas and what business is specifically forbidden to do—is there really such a difference? Neither approach is going to increase anyone's efficiency, further technological progress or cut production costs. And a government-imposed quota offers no more hope of lower prices than an industrial cartel. Quite the contrary, as demonstrated by the workings of the crude oil quotas, a prime objective of these devices is to raise prices in the markets of the countries adopting them.

We don't say that the United States is the only bad actor in this particular picture. Far from it: herds of sacred cows are grazing in many foreign grasslands. We do regret that the one nation which more than any other has shown the world what free competition can produce in the way of economic progress now seems in danger of turning its head in a more desolate direction.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 16, 1967]

KEEP TRADE "FREE"

The dangers, the disadvantages, the nonsense involved in building a system of national trade barriers and quota systems are evident from history: Tariff retaliation by other countries, a choking off of world commerce, international antagonism, a decline in jobs.

Yet the foolish cry for protection continues, as events in Washington show today.

A number of congressmen, moved by industry wailing, are talking about higher trade barriers. Sen. Everett Dirksen of Illinois, the Republican leader, would have the Finance Committee approve import quota systems for a variety of items—oil, lead, zinc, dairy products, beef, steel, perhaps even electronics.

Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana, the committee chairman, thinks the U.S. oil industry needs more trade protection. Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana joins Dirksen in advocating protection for steel.

These men, and the industries involved, take short-sighted, ill-advised positions. As William M. Roth, President Johnson's special trade representative, put it so well:

"If anything is done by Congress on this scale, there will be massive retaliation by other countries against" many major U.S. exports. Mr. Roth rightly adds that the scope of the planned Senate committee action "is so tremendous it would completely destroy our trade policy."

Mr. Roth hardly had uttered his statements before his fears were confirmed by more than a dozen of our best customers:

The six nations in the European Common Market sent a joint letter to the State Department broadly hinting at the retaliation Mr. Roth warned about. Latin-American ambassadors in Washington got together on a similar warning. Such retaliation by these countries would be a devastating blow to American business.

The White House has indicated it supports Mr. Roth's views and opposes the pending protectionist proposals. But in view of the growing campaign, the President himself would do well to speak in outright and complete opposition. He could echo Mr. Roth's arguments and add that better responses to foreign competition are more vigorous marketing policies by U.S. corporations, better management and more rapid modernization.

In one sense, the nation's "free trade" approach dates to Cordell Hull and Franklin Roosevelt. But in a broader sense such a policy is more deeply ingrained in our society. For it was Thomas Jefferson who proclaimed 168 years ago: "I am for free commerce for all nations."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1967]

THE PROTECTIONIST DRIVE

The six countries of the European Common Market have taken the unprecedented step this week of handing the United States a written diplomatic protest against the protectionist measures now pending in Congress. Other European countries and Japan have also been expressing alarm.

Textile, petroleum, steel, meat and dairy interests are, as we noted last week, in the forefront of this major protectionist drive. Their Congressional allies have introduced bills that would replace the country's declining tariff barriers with rigid import quotas that undoubtedly would trigger vast retaliatory moves abroad. Similar measures have been introduced to protect lead, zinc, watches, shoes, glass and even strawberries and mink fur. The whole chemical industry is engaged in a separate fight to head off tariff reductions negotiated in the Kennedy Round.

The Senate is the immediate focus of the protectionist. Considerably more than half its membership is already enlisted in support of one import quota measure or another. These proposals, taken together, would affect \$3.6 billion of commerce, one-third of the country's dutiable imports. But plans are afoot now, according to Senator Dirksen, to add a single omnibus import quota bill that would cover virtually all other imports that offer competition to American producers. Committee passage next week is predicted.

On American initiative, the entire developed world has been engaged for five years in intensive negotiations under the Kennedy Round to dismantle most remaining protective tariffs. President Johnson signed the solemn agreements achieved in these negotiations only last summer. The measures now pending in Congress would vitiate the whole effort.

The nation and the world paid a heavy price in the 1930's when vested interests succeeded in barring competition from abroad, a step toward the repeal of capitalism in the name of an effort to save it. A return to trade restriction would injure the United States more than other countries since it exports more than it imports. The deficit in the nation's payments balance abroad would be increased, weakening the dollar further. A vital brake on inflation would be removed if imports were hampered. Far more workers, farmers, consumers and businessmen would lose through declining export markets and rising prices at home than would gain through added protection of a few domestic sectors of the economy. The blow that would be struck at the unity of the West and the value of the American word abroad would be incalculable.

The current success of the protectionist lobby can only be attributed to the power vacuum that has developed in Washington as Presidential leadership has faded beneath the frustrations of intractable issues such as Vietnam, the urban crisis and the tax fight.

There is a clear need for the bipartisan industrial, export, banking, farm, labor and consumer interests that have led the fight for freer trade since 1934 to organize themselves again to defend the achievements of five Administrations in this field.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1967]

THE PAINS OF PROTECTIONISM

Economists can, and frequently do, muster all sorts of arguments against import curbs. Though their case is convincing, the matter isn't entirely onesided.

To begin with, no academic reasoning will ease the pain of a businessman who believes he is being undone by imports. At the moment such major industries as textiles, meat, steel and oil say they are in that situation, or close to it, and are pressing Congress for new or increased protection.

They contend, quite correctly, that their economic health is important not only to them but to the nation. They also stress the difficulty of competing with foreign firms whose wage costs are lower.

When it comes to proposed relief, the import-troubled industries emphasize their eagerness to be reasonable. For the most part they do not want to shut out all foreign competition; instead, they would merely limit it to a "fair" share of the domestic market. Even that might not be necessary, some spokesmen say, if other nations would only allow the U.S. freer access to their own markets.

Before Congress comes to any decision, however, it should ponder this question's other sides. If the U.S. moves toward protectionism, for instance, what happens to the nation's export trade? As an international merchant, after all, this country still leads the world by a wide margin.

The answer is partly a matter of simple economics. If Country A can no longer sell quite as many textiles to the U.S., it won't earn as many dollars to buy American business machines. Thus the effect would be to limit U.S. exports, even if the only change in the situation was a higher U.S. tariff or lower import quota.

But that's not likely to be the only change. Among nations, as among little boys, there's a tendency to strike back when someone hits you. If history is any guide, then, new U.S. import curbs would quickly bring retaliation abroad, further crimping America's foreign sales.

Turning the question around another way, Congress might consider it from the point of view of consumers. What happens to them if the nation raises new barriers against imports?

For one thing, consumers would often be paying higher prices. Some people may like the snob appeal of a foreign label, but most

Americans buy imports mainly when they believe they're getting more for their money. Trade restrictions, furthermore, obviously limit consumers' freedom of choice.

That brings us back to the economists, who focus most of their attention on a still broader aspect of import curbs: Their effect on the general well-being of the economy. As is their wont, the academicians take a fairly long-run view of things; they find little comfort in the economy's current health if it seems due to degenerate before long.

One prime worry is protectionism's upward pressure on prices. Inflation is already very much with us, even without fresh trade restraints to accentuate it.

Economists also fret about the effects of import curbs on the vitality of domestic industries. If foreign competition is curtailed, domestic producers will have less incentive to increase efficiency and develop new and better products.

Through the past three decades, the domestic economy has expanded enormously while U.S. protectionism has shrunk to a shadow of its former self. While there are numerous reasons for this happy development, not the least of them is stiff competition, some of it furnished by foreigners.

Trade restrictions, in sum, provide benefits for U.S. firms in the domestic market, though these gains may be only temporary. On the other hand, import curbs endanger the nation's exports, impose penalties on consumers and tend to weaken the vigor of the country's economy. Looked at from all sides, the package hardly seems appealing.

If a company is genuinely damaged by imports, machinery already exists to provide job-retaining, technical assistance and the like. If Congress decides that more help is needed, it would be better to pay direct Federal subsidies than to opt for the even more debilitating devices of trade restraint.

For some businessmen, import competition can prove quite painful. From the standpoint of the rest of the nation, however, the agonies of protectionism could be a good deal worse.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of two or three of the bills that are pending in the Senate Committee on Finance at this time. One of the bills concerns a quota on dairy imports, and one concerns a quota on meat imports.

I voted for the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and I recently signed a report of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee which sets forth policies regarding expanded trade and its need so far as the best interests of the United States are concerned.

I point this out because I hope the Senator from Illinois will understand that I believe, in my conscience, that I can take the actions I have mentioned with a clear conscience and be consistent at the same time.

I believe the Senator is familiar with Mr. Roth's testimony before the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, that our position in the Kennedy round of negotiations before the Common Market countries was that we should be given access to their market for our feed grain.

We were not asking for anything more than a percentage of their market reflected in a base period. Mr. Roth, as I recall, stated that this was our negotia-

ting position; and our position was, further, that as the economy and the populations of the Common Market countries grew, our percentage of the access would remain fixed, but the volume within that percentage would grow.

I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he believes that was a fair position.

Mr. PERCY. First, may I reply by stating my high regard for the intelligent approach always taken by the distinguished Senator from Iowa to these complex problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. I know, also, that he is well aware that his great State of Iowa, a sister State of Illinois, is one of the most productive States and areas in the world, and that it not only is a leader in industrial and manufactured goods production, but also in agricultural production.

Let me first comment on the dependence of the State of Iowa upon exports for manufactured goods. In 1966—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I might remind my colleague that I have made many public speeches, not only in Iowa, but in other parts of the country as well, in which I have invited my audiences' attention to the degree to which the Iowa economy depends upon exports. So I am very familiar with that matter. But I should like to have a response from the Senator as to whether or not he believes that the position of Mr. Roth and our negotiators before the Common Market, with respect to the access of our feed grains, was a fair position.

Mr. PERCY. I should first like to put into the RECORD the figure indicating Iowa's great contribution to the exports of this country and to the balance of payments of this country—\$353 million in 1966. That represents a large amount of employment in the area of manufactured goods.

On the subject of agricultural products, I think the important thing for us to remember is that Australia and New Zealand are the principal countries which wish to export dairy products into this country. Here we have two countries which are our staunchest allies in Vietnam. No one would take second place to the Senator from Iowa in his firm resolve to have this country and its allies stand firm in Vietnam. But I would simply ask whether or not the reaction of Australia and New Zealand, two countries which are already limited by quotas on the amount of products they can ship to this country, and are greatly desirous of buying from this country, should be taken into account when we consider foreign trade policy?

Second, I point to the fact that the great bulk of our exports, and our favorable balance of payments, lie in the field of agriculture. If we did not have these markets abroad, where countries

could buy and pay for the food we ship to them, would not the economy of Illinois and Iowa be markedly injured?

We cannot select a few products and say these products need quota restrictions because as to them we have a less favorable competitive position than some other countries. We must look at the total complex and say that on some items we can produce cheaper than someone else; and we must be willing to take in certain imports from other countries when they demonstrate they can produce that food and put it on the American table more cheaply than our farmers can.

This is a two-way street. I feel that artificial restrictions in the way of imports of food products in the end severely injure the long-term interest of the American farmer, and most certainly the agriculture implement producers of this country whose tremendous exports have brought great dollar revenue and employment to this country.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would answer the question which I have asked him. I take it, by the fact that he has not, that he must feel the position of the U.S. Government before the Common Market, in asking not for any increase in our percentage of access to their market, but only the same percentage we had during the base period, was unfair.

Mr. PERCY. I think it is totally and grossly unfair to those in this country for them to impose an artificial restriction on imports, and it is unfair to those countries for us to do so, because they cannot expand and take advantage of the market.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. What would the Senator think if, as a businessman, I came to Congress and said, "We are perfectly willing to let cameras come in, but we want to take the base period of 1946, 1947, and 1948, and only allow them to ship in cameras so long as they do not exceed the percentages of those years. I saw it go from zero to 4, to 6, and 10, and in still cameras as high as 70 percent. But the combination of engineering, research, design, production, sales, and merchandising enable the U.S. photographic industry to recapture the markets we had had available to us on an economic basis and we are the stronger today because of it.

I think such restrictions would be totally unfair and unrealistic. Would we want other countries to say, "You cannot gain a greater proportion of our market than you have"? If we put this in the deep freeze, we would greatly restrict our ability to grow and we would greatly restrict our ability to produce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa seek recognition?

Mr. MILLER. I do, Mr. President, unless the Senator asks for additional time. I wish to continue the colloquy.

Mr. PERCY. I would like the Senator to have additional time. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I regret that my colleague thinks that Mr. Roth and his negotiators were taking an unfair position in asking the Common Market for a percentage quota for our feed grains. I do believe that they took a fair position, and the Senator knows the Common Market simply denied everything. I think the Common Market took a very unfair position. Because they took this very unfair position we do not have a two-way street. Free trade is not a one-way street; free trade is a two-way street.

Our negotiators asked the Common Market during the Kennedy round negotiations to let the United States continue to have this fixed percentage, fixed on the base period, and the Common Market slammed the door and we received nothing. However, I think our position was eminently fair. All of these bills I am talking about that are pending in the Committee on Finance take the same position with respect to ourselves as we asked the Common Market to take with respect to themselves.

We are not throwing up a protectionist wall and saying, "Keep your imports out of the United States." We say, "Continue your exports to the United States, but do not take the lion's share of our increased domestic consumption."

I can assure the Senator that the dairy industry in this country is a sick industry today because of what has happened in the last 3 or 4 years. If we are not careful we will have a milk shortage in this country one of these days because of the flood of imports coming in, which is causing dairy farmers to go out of business.

In 1960 we imported 300 million pounds in milk equivalent products. In 1965, the figure went up to 900 million pounds. In 1966, it went up to 2.7 billion pounds. This year it was running at an annual rate in excess of 4 billion pounds until the President took action on July 1 to cut it back.

I suggest to the Senator that I do not think it is being protectionist to say to them, "Continue to export your dairy products to the United States, but do not take the lion's share or all of our increased domestic consumption."

I do not think this is a throwback to the old Smoot-Hawley days of throwing up a wall. My record in support of the Trade Expansion Act is good evidence of how I feel about it. However, it must be a two-way street and not a one-way street.

I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the dairy farmers of this country are not asking for a great big protectionist wall, but they do say, "Make it a two-way street," and they think it has been a one-way street so far.

The same is true to a lesser extent in the livestock industry, and this relates not only to New Zealand and Australia; it also relates to Ireland and Argentina. I must say that while I recognize Australia would like to take over all of our meat market, they should be content to make it a two-way street, and it has not been that in the last 2 or 3 years.

It would be wrong for us to go to them and say, "Let us take over all of your increased consumption of manufactured

products," when they are able to produce for a good share of their market.

I want to put this in perspective, because I know the Senator feels strongly about world trade. I feel as strongly as he feels, but I do not think we should be carried away with the spirit of exports and world trade to the extent that we ignore the abuse of that principle by some of our foreign trading partners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional 5 minutes. I wish to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, who has been waiting, if it would inconvenience him for us to proceed with this colloquy.

Mr. MONRONEY. No, indeed. The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois is making a most important speech, one that I think needs to be thoroughly aired on the floor of the Senate, and he is an authority on that subject. I do not object to a continuation of the colloquy. I have time to wait and to enjoy the colloquy, as well.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

May I ask the Senator from Illinois this question, following the very interesting colloquy he just had with the Senator from Iowa: Is it not true that if the argument of the Senator from Iowa prevailed, the Senator from Iowa would have a particular part of the national economy seeking to retrade many aspects of a multilateral deal made between the United States and many other countries? He would have an excellent case for a particular product. But are we willing also to retrade that for the whole range of manufactured products which come under the Kennedy round, and to undo everything that has been done there, simply because we are worried or concerned about problems affecting the meat industry or the dairy industry?

My State happens to be a bigger State than the State of the Senator from Iowa in terms of dairying. New York would feel it very keenly, too, considering everything else involved in this situation.

One other question: Is it not true that we have an enormous export trade in agricultural products? It may not happen to be in the dairy business, but we do have an enormous surplus of agricultural products for export from the United States. Are we not faced with a problem in which we shall have to say to individual interests: "Surely, we understand your situation. We will do our utmost to cope with it"? That is why we have the adjustment assistance idea. That is why we are spending \$5 billion to support agriculture in this country. I think much of it is necessary. But we have simply got to look at all our trade and make business deals on a multilateral basis, if we can. That does not mean we have to give up on agriculture. We had a pretty big fight on chickens in the foreign market, and we got results. But we cannot do that on every product, because we do not have everything to trade.

Mr. PERCY. First, I should like to emphasize that I am well aware that the distinguished Senator from Iowa has been outspoken in defending the principles of freer trade. He believes in the free market. He has lived that principle for all of his years in public life. I am well aware of the fact that he has a responsibility to look to the gross inequities that exist when we give away a trading point without getting a commensurate trading point in return. Overall, I have felt that the Kennedy round has been a satisfactory round. We have gained, I believe, as much as we have given. But there are certain inequities. I want better to inform myself on the subject, because I have the same vital dairy industry in my State that the Senator from Iowa has in his State.

I should like to discuss in detail what actually did happen in the trading round of negotiations to see whether undue discrimination held forth.

But I must not allow the Senator from Iowa to misconstrue my earlier remarks. I do not believe that the late Gov. Christian Herter and Ambassador Roth acted unwisely in taking the position they did vis-a-vis the Common Market. At the time, in 1963, that position seemed like the most reasonable and practical way of protecting our substantial grain exports to the Common Market. It did not work. We will have to try new approaches, approaches that will buttress the marketplace concept, rather than the trade restriction concept.

I should like to point out that in my judgment we have to look at the underlying source of these problems. I think that the agricultural industry, as such, is a sick industry because it has been subjected to too much rigidity, too much Government control, and not enough free play of the marketplace. The fact that the Government has been the largest buyer of dairy products, controlling prices and products, may well be the underlying cause for the fact that it seems unable successfully to compete in world markets today.

We cannot precipitately pull the rug out from under an industry which has been subjected to Government internal regulation for 30 years. Therefore, I should like to work with the Senator from Iowa to find ways to remove inequities and work toward—and I believe he agrees, and the distinguished Senator from New York would also agree—a freer market all over the free world as well as in this country.

Let us not, then, require the overall adjustment of the trade policy to be fitted into the pattern of any particular industry. We must deal with that inequity as such and try to find a proper remedy, but not mere expedients that wreck the whole policy. Of course, I know that the Senator from Iowa has no such intention because he has believed in it, spent much time and fought for it in the past, and has indicated that in 99 percent of the areas we are in complete agreement.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may make a comment on that?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I think that the Senator from New York has made two points. The first point is that for the sake of, let us say, the dairy industry, we should not gut the future of other industries, because that is what would happen if we had a quota based upon a reasonable base period, which would allow foreign exporters of dairy products to the United States to continue to export to the United States, but to be content with a percentage of our increased domestic consumption.

Now my reaction is pretty cold to that. I cannot understand why there would be a reaction on the part of our trading partners that because we said, "You are only going to be able to take a certain percentage of our market based upon the base period, and you are only going to be able to take an increased amount of our domestic consumption based upon that percentage," they would go back into their tents and sulk; and then say, "All right, we will cut off everything else so far as your exports to us are concerned."

They might retaliate by going for the very proposal that Mr. Roth and his negotiators presented to the Common Market; namely, that the United States will be allowed to continue to export at a fixed percentage based upon a base period, and thus to increase our volume within this percentage as their populations and their economies grow. I think that would be a wonderful way to retaliate. I wish that the Common Market had retaliated in that way. They did not. We got nothing.

The Senator from New York said that we had some trouble in the chicken war, yet we got some results.

I would remind the Senator that the results are that chicken exports from the United States to the Common Market are practically nil. I do not think those are very desirable results. If it is going to be that way, then we will end up with a one-way street in our foreign trade policy, and I cannot see anything but trouble ahead.

I think the tragic part of this situation is that it is a very complex subject. We have only a few bills pending in the Finance Committee. My guess is that they will not deal with more than 20 or 30 items. The Kennedy round negotiators spent years going through thousands of items. I cannot understand why dealing with a few items on a quota basis, and a fair quota basis, will jeopardize the whole future on all of the thousands of other items. I think that there is a little too much scare talk going on here. Besides, I think our position is fair.

It is not going to be responsive to suggest that we are becoming protectionists, putting up a wall, and not permitting any exports to come in here. I do not know of any dairy farmers, livestock raisers, or cosponsors of any of the bills in the Finance Committee who are standing for that.

If someone wants to set up a strawman and shoot it down, that would be a nice exercise, but it will not be responsive. We need responsive arguments here. The only point I wish to make is that we are oversimplifying a terribly

complex and important subject. It will take a lot more than just a few minutes' discussion to get the job done, to have this subject thoroughly thought through on the floor of the Senate.

I very much appreciate my colleague's yielding to me.

Mr. PERCY. I certainly do agree with the Senator from Iowa that this is a very complex subject. In the body of my statement, that is the principal point I made. The complexity is so great that for Congress to attempt, in its closing weeks, to rush through some quota restrictions would do irreparable damage and would likely be inequitable because of the lack of time to give careful consideration to each of the complexities. And as I said earlier, the imports affected by the pending bills are approximately one-half of the total imports into the United States. This is no small amount.

Now, from the standpoint of the chicken war, I think it is a great tribute to the farmers of this country that today we can raise chickens in the barnyard here and put them on a table in Germany cheaper than Germany can raise them in their own barnyards.

I have such faith in the integrity, capacity, and ingenuity of the American producer, whether he be on the farm or in the factory, that I want to see that faith exemplified by greater efforts toward removal of restrictions abroad.

The only basis we have for knocking down those restrictions that prevent that chicken from getting on the table in Germany and lowering the cost of living for the people of Germany and other countries is by keeping our hands clean over here. I submit this is not the time to start imposing restrictions against other countries so that, rather than remove the restrictions they have, they retaliate with additional restrictions against us.

I want to thank the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] very much for his great patience and generosity in giving us this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be but 1 minute more to put a few facts in the RECORD.

I, too, would like to apologize to the Senator from Oklahoma for imposing on him and to thank him for his patience.

I am quoting from a document prepared by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, entitled "U.S. Foreign Trade Policy After the Kennedy Round."

I ask unanimous consent that a number of paragraphs be inserted in my remarks which show that while agricultural protectionism is very strong in the European Common Market—and I will stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues in fighting it—we do nonetheless sell to them. In 1966 the Common Market countries alone bought 30 percent of all U.S. agricultural products sold for dollars.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Agricultural protectionism in the European Economic Community continues to be strong. The imposition of variable levies on feed grains, wheat, and a number of other products important among U.S. agricultural ex-

ports, by which tariffs are levied against imports from outside the Community to equalize prices within the Community and world prices, is causing considerable worry in American agricultural circles. Nevertheless, in 1966 the Common Market countries purchased 30 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports sold for dollars.

U.S. farmers, as a whole, have little to worry about with respect to exports of agricultural products against which the EEC countries have not imposed variable levies. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture,¹ such commodities accounted for 58 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports to the EEC in 1966 and included soybeans, oil cake and meal, unmanufactured tobacco, fruits and vegetables, and raw cotton.

It is only with regard to the remaining 42 percent of agricultural exports that the variable levies of the EEC may prove troublesome.

¹ Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, U.S. Department of Agriculture, March, 1967.

Principal among the commodities that are subject to such levies are: feed grains, wheat, rice, poultry and eggs. The most important question, from the point of view of U.S. agriculture, as a whole, is whether the expansion of the EEC in the course of the next few decades will result in increased demand for the commodities included in the noncompetitive group sufficiently to counterbalance the effects of European protection against imports of commodities subject to the levies.

There is danger, however, of reaching the premature conclusion that exports of products subject to variable levies will decrease, while only those not subject to such levies will increase. Such a conclusion is not warranted by U.S. export statistics through 1966.

Between 1962 and 1966 U.S. exports to the EEC of products that are subject to variable levies actually increased more rapidly (37.3 percent) than did the exports of products that are not subject to them (34.5 percent). Changes in U.S. agricultural exports to the EEC are shown in the following tables:

TABLE 3.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, 1962-66

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	1962		1966		Increase	Percent change
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent		
Subject to variable levy.....	\$482,786	42.0	\$662,657	42.4	+\$179,871	+37.3
Not subject to variable levy.....	667,945	58.0	898,575	57.6	+230,630	+34.5
Total.....	1,150,731	100.0	1,561,232	100.0	+410,501	+35.7

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

It is natural, of course, that American farmers producing crops that are subject to variable levies should want to have those levies removed. Every producer, whether he produces for home consumption or for export, would like to have an assured market.

However, European farmers are as adamant about admitting competitive products from abroad as are those farmers in the United

States who produce crops with which imports—if not restricted by tariffs or import quotas—would compete, such as tulip bulbs, dairy products, and tomatoes. In other words, it is argued that if American farmers and manufacturers want to secure ready access to European markets they will have to be willing that access be granted to United States markets.

TABLE 4.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, SUBJECT TO VARIABLE LEVIES, 1962-66

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	1962	1966	Increase or decrease	Percentage change
Feed grains.....	\$317,081	\$476,439	+\$159,358	+50.3
Wheat.....	50,603	107,096	+56,493	+111.6
Rice.....	14,247	18,823	+4,576	+32.1
Turkeys.....	9,624	13,523	+3,899	+40.5
Poultry and eggs.....	43,281	9,379	-33,902	-78.3
Rye grain.....	18,709	4,417	-14,292	-76.4
Wheat flour.....	5,553	1,358	-4,195	-75.5
Pork.....	341	1,339	+998	+292.7
Dairy products.....	3,603	1,211	-2,392	-66.4
Beef and veal.....	64	900	+836	+1,306.0
All others.....	19,680	28,172	+8,492	+43.2
Total.....	482,786	662,657	+\$179,871	+37.3

¹ Summary: Increases +\$234,652; decreases -\$54,781.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

TABLE 5.—U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO THE EEC, NOT SUBJECT TO VARIABLE LEVIES, 1962-66

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

	1962	1966	Increase or decrease	Percentage change
Soybeans.....	\$162,320	\$278,676	+\$116,356	+71.7
Oil cake and meal.....	46,020	143,998	+97,978	+212.9
Tobacco (unmanufactured).....	105,543	119,917	+14,374	+13.6
Fruits and vegetables.....	91,169	87,091	-4,078	-4.5
Raw cotton.....	105,973	65,885	-40,088	-37.8
Variety meats (fresh, frozen).....	16,327	35,051	+18,724	+114.7
Tallow.....	26,375	34,660	+8,285	+31.4
Hides and skins.....	20,560	28,384	+7,824	+38.1
Vegetable oils, expressed.....	13,161	15,851	+2,690	+20.4
All others.....	80,497	89,062	+8,565	+10.6
Total.....	667,945	898,575	+\$230,630	+34.5

¹ Summary: Increases +\$274,796; decreases -\$44,166.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, USDA, March 1967.

Mr. JAVITS. I may not have made clear my point on the chickens. It is a fact that U.S. chicken exports to the Common Market countries have been cut in 1963 by \$26 million, but we retaliated against that by cutting \$26 million of their exports of brandy, trucks, dextrine, and potato starch to us. That is an entirely different picture than what is before us in the matter of these quotas.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, so that the Senate may take up a privileged matter?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the purpose of bringing up a privileged matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I shall not take long.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 25, 1967, page 29945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall make only a few brief remarks.

The total appropriation allowed is \$2,169,012,500. This sum is \$178,790,695 below the total budget estimates and \$25,014,000 under the House allowance. It is \$17,093,000 under the sum recommended by the Senate.

Generally, it is a good bill and provides sufficient funds for the necessary expenses of the various departments and agencies in fiscal 1968. As my colleagues know, the activities included in this bill have been operating since July 1 under the continuing resolutions of the Congress.

I should mention some of the important items that had been added by the Senate and were either reduced or denied in conference.

For the State Department, the conferees approved \$490,000, or one-half of the \$890,000 increase recommended for the passport office to cope with the increased workload and the financing of

expenses for the final wrap-up of the sixth round of the Geneva tariff negotiations. The conferees disapproved the language amendment of the Senate relating to North Vietnam. However, a majority of the conferees were in agreement with such language but felt it should be a part of a legislative bill rather than an appropriation bill, and so stated in the report of the conferees.

As respects the Department of Commerce, the conferees disapproved the increases recommended by the Senate in the following categories: \$1,000,000 for operations and administration, Economic Development Administration; \$1,000,000 for the U.S. Travel Service; \$9,353,000 for the Environmental Science Services Administration; \$2,050,000 for the National Bureau of Standards; and \$1,500,000 for the Office of State Technical Services.

Conversely, the conferees agreed to the Senate recommendation to reduce by \$25,000,000 the House allowance for the Appalachian Development Highway System.

For the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the conferees agreed to the House allowance of \$9,000,000 instead of the Senate recommendation of \$9,500,000. For salaries and expenses of the U.S. Information Agency, the increase of \$640,000 proposed by the Senate was not agreed to by the conferees.

The Senate amendment deleting the expenditure limitation as proposed by the House was agreed to by the conferees.

I urge adoption of the report, as I earnestly believe, under the circumstances that are present today, we have a very good bill. All conferees agreed to the sums finally reported for the various departments and agencies contained in the bill.

Mr. President, I think every member of the conference, both from the Senate and the House, were seriously cognizant of the fiscal problems that are immediate, and with which we are confronted, with respect to the heavy burden of financing the Vietnam war and other peacetime programs that have been inaugurated during recent years, and also of the appeals being made, and possibly the urgent need, for an increase in taxes to raise revenues to meet the costs of these obligations.

This was true in the Appropriations Committee, and also had its impact and influence in the discussions in conference. We simply had to do some giving and taking. There had to be some compromises and adjustments made.

I think the conferees deserve the confidence and approval of the respective Chambers, because I found that the conferees on the part of the House, under the direction of Representative ROONEY of New York, were sympathetic to many of the increases that were made by the Senate in the categories to which I have referred, but again they felt constrained, as did many of us, to hold many of these expenditures down to the bare minimum that would permit the proper functioning of these agencies and the carrying on of these activities and programs. That is what we have tried to do, and I hope our labors and the conference report will have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not

intrude further on the time of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] except on this issue. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I shall not challenge this report, which I think has been described properly by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The basis upon which I would challenge it is too narrow to challenge so extensive a compromise agreement, but I think it is very important to challenge the lack of wisdom in cutting 25 percent out of the appropriation for the U.S. Travel Service, an appropriation of \$4 million as provided in the Senate, and \$3 million as allowed by the committee, which is really shortsighted in the extreme. It should be called markedly to the attention of the country.

I do it because I have a rather deep feeling about the financial condition of the country. The estimated deficit from travel this year, as between Americans that go abroad and what they spend there and foreigners who come here and what they spend here, is somewhere between \$1.65 billion and \$1.8 billion. The deficit last year was \$1.644 billion.

Our principal travel competitors have increased their travel budgets by as much as 300 percent. Our budget has remained the same for 7 years now, and buys infinitely less because we all know costs have gone up at least one-third, in round figures.

The Arthur D. Little survey of the U.S. Travel Service indicates that our promotional efforts since 1961 have added a minimum of \$250 million in revenues from foreign tourists, and perhaps \$400 million. That is a ratio of 35 to 1 in terms of benefits as compared to what we have appropriated. An excellent case was made to show that more money put into the situation is directly translated into more tourists, more promotional literature, and more work in their offices.

I point out that this is terribly shortsighted economy. I do not know of anything worse we could do, when a \$2 million or \$3 million item in a budget of the size of the Federal budget is a very small amount, especially when translated into what it means to the United States in terms of added income to this country. The whole thing seems ridiculous to me, and I just have to protest it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to advise the distinguished Senator from New York that his position was not without the strong support of some who agreed with that position completely in conference. The Senator from Florida brought up this point in conference, and stated that in his opinion this would be an excellent investment. The Senator from New York will recall that he and I, at the hearings and in the committee, were both of the feeling that there could not be anything done which would more fully contribute to the solution of our balance-of-payments deficit than the enlargement of this program.

However, I am sorry to say that this matter of economy seems to have become a fetish to the degree that sometimes it

operates to encourage false economy, and I think this is one of the situations in which it does.

I merely wanted to assure the distinguished Senator from New York that there were members of the conference who felt as he does, and who brought up this point of view. Unfortunately, we were in the minority.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much. I can assure him there is no other ally I would rather have than the Senator from Florida on this point, and that we will fight another day.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New York, and thank the able chairman for his competent handling of the matter in the committee, through passage, in conference, and now again on the floor of the Senate. This is a very difficult bill. There is no other bill which involves the handling of funds for four departments of Government. The Senator from Arkansas has, as always, done a most able job, and it has been a pleasure to be associated with him in the effort.

I am sure he feels as I do, that none of us were able to accomplish everything we would like to have seen accomplished, particularly because of the economy wave which is so pronounced at this time. I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for the prudence, good nature, and dispatch with which he has handled this

matter. I want him to know I think he has done a remarkably fine job.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, there were, as has been stated here, members of the conference who were very hopeful that the Senate figure could be retained; but we found, on the part of the House conferees, the disposition not to approve it, for the simple reason that has been stated—an effort to try to hold the total appropriation down.

I call attention, however, in the Senate report on this bill, on page 20, to the paragraph entitled "U.S. Travel Service"; and I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that paragraph be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 571) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE

In connection with this appropriation, the committee directs that the State Department, through its overseas embassies and consular offices, take much more vigorous action in the promotion of tourism in co-operation with the U.S. Travel Service. This should include efforts on the part of our embassies to work out with local governments the problem of the amount of funds which may be used for travel of their nationals to the United States. It is also directed that the Travel Service increase the

amount of promotional material which they furnished the embassies and consular offices in order to carry out an accelerated program. In connection with the submission of the fiscal year 1969 budget justifications, the committee will expect a report on the progress made by this combined effort and an accounting of the results obtained from the increased appropriation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like, Mr. President, to emphasize the point made in this report that it is the belief of many of us that our embassies could be more active in this field than they are at present, and could well give a little more attention and a little more effort to encouraging tourist travel to the United States. I do not say that would be adequate, whatever they may be able to do, to compensate fully for the loss of this million dollars; but I do feel, Mr. President, that we should ask them to take note of these views expressed in this report, and I hope when the appropriation bill comes up next year, they will be able to come to us and point out some significant effort that they have made to be more cooperative, and to encourage tourist travel to this country.

Mr. President, if there is no further colloquy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary table on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968 PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Appropriation estimate, 1968	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
Educational exchange fund.....	\$353,000	\$353,000	
Payment to the Republic of Panama.....	1,930,000	1,930,000	
Total, Department of State.....	2,283,000	2,283,000	
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....		5,888,000	+\$5,888,000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	2,283,000	8,171,000	+5,888,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Corporation	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action	Conference bill compared with—		
						Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE								
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated.....	\$2,512,000	\$2,764,000	\$2,714,000	\$2,714,000	\$2,714,000	—\$50,000

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$190,400,000	\$195,200,000	\$193,150,000	\$194,130,000	\$193,640,000
Representation allowances.....	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000	993,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad.....	15,500,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000	13,350,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program).....	6,250,000	5,025,000	5,025,000	5,025,000	5,025,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.....	1,600,000	4,800,000	1,600,000	4,100,000	4,100,000
Total, administration of foreign affairs.....	214,743,000	219,368,000	214,118,000	217,598,000	217,108,000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
Contributions to international organizations.....	104,126,000	109,362,000	93,735,400	93,735,400	93,735,400
Missions to international organizations.....	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000
International conferences and contingencies.....	1,943,000	2,028,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000
International tariff negotiations.....	850,000				
International conference on water for peace.....	500,000				
Total, international organizations and conferences.....	111,189,000	115,160,000	99,448,400	99,448,400	99,448,400

See footnotes at end of speech.

CXIII—1901—Part 22

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$851,000	\$851,000	\$851,000	\$851,000	\$851,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000	1,985,000
Construction.....	5,754,000	* 9,769,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Chamizal settlement.....	4,200,000	2,760,000	2,500,000	2,760,000	2,700,000
American sections, international commissions.....	650,000	675,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
International fisheries commissions.....	2,125,000	2,375,000	1,975,000	2,375,000	2,125,000
Total, international commissions.....	15,565,000	18,415,000	16,961,000	17,621,000	17,311,000
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE					
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities.....	47,000,000	49,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
Center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West.....	6,050,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
Total, educational exchange.....	53,050,000	54,800,000	51,800,000	51,800,000	51,800,000
Total, title I, Department of State.....	394,547,000	407,743,000	382,327,400	386,467,400	385,667,400

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, general administration.....	\$5,743,000	\$6,000,000	\$5,858,000	\$5,858,000	\$5,858,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	21,981,000	22,525,000	22,375,000	22,375,000	22,375,000
Alien property activities, limitation on general administrative expenses.....	(80,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	7,495,000	7,620,000	7,620,000	7,620,000	7,620,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals.....	35,404,000	36,575,000	36,400,000	36,400,000	36,400,000
Fees and expenses of witness.....	2,800,000	3,300,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
Law enforcement assistance.....	7,250,000	19,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Community Relation Service.....	1,500,000	2,700,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, legal activities and general administration.....	82,173,000	97,720,000	87,353,000	84,853,000	84,853,000
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	182,325,000	186,574,000	186,574,000	186,574,000	186,574,000
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	78,835,000	80,400,000	79,946,000	79,946,000	79,946,000
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	60,707,000	463,230,000	61,000,000	62,000,000	61,750,000
Buildings and facilities.....	5,000,000	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Support of U.S. prisoners.....	4,700,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Total, Federal prison system.....	65,407,000	72,730,000	65,500,000	66,500,000	66,250,000
Total, title II, Department of Justice.....	408,740,000	437,424,000	419,373,000	417,873,000	417,623,000

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$3,908,000	\$4,040,000	\$3,970,000	\$3,970,000	\$3,970,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,800,000	3,180,000	2,868,000	2,868,000	2,868,000
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
Salaries and expenses.....	16,394,000	17,076,000	16,750,000	16,750,000	16,750,000
1964 Census of Agriculture.....	1,846,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
Preparation for Nineteenth Decennial Census.....	2,750,000	7,650,000	7,650,000	7,650,000	7,650,000
1967 economic censuses.....	3,000,000	7,718,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
1967 Census of Governments.....	1,300,000	1,050,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Modernization of computing equipment.....	1,900,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
1968 sample household survey.....		20,000,000			
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	27,190,000	57,494,000	36,900,000	36,900,000	36,900,000
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE					
Development facilities grants.....	170,000,000	(0)			
Technical and community assistance.....	25,000,000	(0)			
Economic development center assistance.....	10,000,000	(0)			
Economic development.....	85,000,000	(0)			
Regional economic planning.....	6,100,000	(0)			
Development facilities.....	(0)	* 181,756,000	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000
Industrial development loans and guarantees.....	(0)	57,900,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
Planning, technical assistance, and research.....	(0)	* 29,450,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Operations and administration.....	(0)	* 22,344,000	20,000,000	21,000,000	20,000,000
Appalachian development highway system.....	100,000,000	100,000,000	95,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Total, economic development assistance.....	396,100,000	* 391,450,000	370,000,000	346,000,000	345,000,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,663,000	6,350,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
Defense production and industrial readiness.....	(0)	1,958,000	(0)		
Total, Business and Defense Services Administration.....	5,663,000	8,308,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
Salaries and expenses.....	11,358,000	12,387,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Export control.....	5,093,000	5,263,000	5,263,000	5,263,000	5,263,000
Total, international activities.....	16,651,000	17,850,000	16,963,000	16,963,000	16,963,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$4,450,000	\$4,800,000	\$4,583,000	\$4,583,000	\$4,583,000
PARTICIPATION IN U.S. EXPOSITIONS					
HemisFair 1968 exposition.....	6,750,000				
Inter-American cultural and trade center.....	5,870,000				
Total, participation in U.S. expositions.....	12,620,000				
U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,000,000	4,700,000	3,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	102,713,000	⁹ 113,430,000	105,000,000	110,846,000	105,000,000
Research and development.....	20,537,000	¹⁰ 29,979,000	24,000,000	26,997,000	24,000,000
Research and development (special foreign currency program).....	500,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Facilities, equipment, and construction.....	6,000,000	6,117,000	5,200,000	5,710,000	5,200,000
Satellite operations.....	27,000,000	32,200,000	28,100,000	28,100,000	28,100,000
Total, Environmental Science Services Administration.....	156,750,000	182,476,000	163,050,000	172,403,000	163,050,000
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	37,050,000	¹¹ 39,975,000	38,200,000	38,200,000	38,200,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Research and technical services.....	31,076,000	¹² 38,542,000	31,750,000	33,750,000	31,750,000
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program).....	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Plant and facilities.....	550,000	1,470,000	240,000	290,000	240,000
Construction of facilities.....	1,200,000				
Total, National Bureau of Standards.....	33,326,000	40,512,000	32,490,000	34,540,000	32,490,000
OFFICE OF STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES					
Grants and expenses.....	5,500,000	11,000,000	6,500,000	8,000,000	6,500,000
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
Ship construction.....	106,685,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	143,000,000	143,000,000
Operating differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization).....	175,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Research and development.....	7,500,000	7,625,000	9,575,000	9,575,000	9,575,000
Salaries and expenses.....	15,701,100	15,947,000	15,947,000	15,947,000	15,947,000
Maritime training.....	4,558,900	4,620,000	4,620,000	4,620,000	4,620,000
State marine schools.....	1,635,000	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000	1,775,000
Total, Maritime Administration.....	311,080,000	372,967,000	374,917,000	374,917,000	374,917,000
Total, title III, Department of Commerce.....	1,016,088,000	1,138,752,000	1,059,291,000	1,049,194,000	1,034,291,000

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
Salaries.....	\$2,000,000	\$2,124,000	\$2,031,500	\$2,031,500	\$2,031,500
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports.....	138,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Miscellaneous expenses.....	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
Care of the building and grounds.....	324,300	327,500	327,500	327,500	327,500
Automobile for the Chief Justice.....	8,900	9,100	9,100	9,100	9,100
Books for the Supreme Court.....	38,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	2,629,200	2,775,600	2,683,100	2,683,100	2,683,100
COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS					
Salaries and expenses.....	471,000	483,000	483,000	483,000	483,000
CUSTOMS COURT					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,265,000	¹³ 1,580,595	1,430,000	1,480,000	1,480,000
COURT OF CLAIMS					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,440,000	1,519,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
Salaries of judges.....	15,857,000	16,540,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	16,300,000
Salaries of supporting personnel.....	38,290,000	41,217,000	40,490,000	40,490,000	40,490,000
Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel.....	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	7,700,000	8,000,000	7,900,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	6,000,000	6,249,000	6,113,000	6,113,000	6,113,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts.....	1,950,000	2,574,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000
Referees, special account:					
Salaries of referees.....	(4,318,500)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)	(4,514,000)
Expenses of referees.....	(6,930,000)	(7,528,000)	(7,360,000)	(7,360,000)	(7,360,000)
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....	72,797,000	78,080,000	76,027,000	75,927,000	75,927,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, excluding special accounts.....	78,602,200	84,438,195	82,123,100	82,073,100	82,073,100
Total, title IV, the judiciary, including special accounts.....	89,850,700	96,480,195	93,997,100	93,947,100	93,947,100

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$2,160,000	\$2,370,000	\$2,370,000	2,370,000	\$2,370,000
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,500,000	2,790,000	2,650,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
See footnotes at end of speech.					

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN BILL FOR 1968—Continued

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968 (amended)	House bill, 1968	Senate bill, 1968	Conference action
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Office of Education: Civil rights educational activities.....	\$8,028,000	\$30,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,240,000	7,170,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,419,000	3,725,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws.....	200,000				
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Salaries and expenses.....	550,000				
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation.....	8,100,000	14,991,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
Transfer from revolving funds.....	(45,750,000)	(48,147,000)	(47,647,000)	(47,647,000)	(47,647,000)
Participation sales authorizations.....	(850,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....		1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Total, Small Business Administration.....	8,100,000	12,341,000	11,250,000	11,250,000	11,250,000
Southeast hurricane disaster.....	9,000,000				
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS					
Salaries and expenses.....	566,000	566,000	490,000	490,000	490,000
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	289,500	330,000	295,000	295,000	295,000
TARIFF COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,562,000	3,775,000	3,675,000	3,675,000	3,675,000
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY					
Arms control and disarmament activities.....	9,000,000	10,000,000	9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY					
Salaries and expenses.....	152,238,000	159,679,000	156,479,000	157,119,000	156,479,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....	10,941,000	10,158,000	10,158,000	8,604,000	8,604,000
Special international exhibitions.....	2,709,000	3,584,000	2,709,000	2,709,000	2,709,000
Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program).....	3,350,000	3,387,000	3,387,000	3,387,000	3,387,000
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities.....	6,510,000	19,254,000	18,200,000	18,200,000	18,200,000
Total, U.S. Information Agency.....	172,748,000	193,062,000	187,933,000	187,019,000	186,379,000
Total, title V, related agencies.....	227,362,500	267,404,000	239,038,000	238,624,000	237,484,000
Grand total.....	2,136,588,200	2,347,803,195	2,194,026,500	2,186,105,500	2,169,012,500
Consisting of—					
Special accounts.....	11,248,500	12,042,000	11,874,000	11,874,000	11,874,000
Indefinite appropriations.....		1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000	1,350,000
Direct appropriations.....	2,125,339,700	2,334,411,195	2,180,802,500	2,172,881,500	

¹ Includes \$3,200,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 38.

² Plus \$15,606,000 for 1968 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

³ Reflects decrease of \$2,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

⁴ Includes \$1,130,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

⁵ \$4,500,000 to be derived from prior year funds.

⁶ Contained in different item due to realignment of appropriation structure.

⁷ Excludes budget estimate for Appalachian assistance programs not authorized.

⁸ Funded under Office of Emergency Planning.

⁹ Includes increase of \$676,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

¹⁰ Includes increase of \$150,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

¹¹ Includes increase of \$300,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

¹² Includes increase of \$227,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

¹³ Includes \$101,195 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

¹⁴ Includes \$430,000 supplemental estimate, S. Doc. 32.

¹⁵ Requested in the budget as a permanent, indefinite appropriation.

¹⁶ Reflects decrease of \$1,221,000 contained in H. Doc. 114.

¹⁷ Includes \$4,861,195 supplemental estimates, S. Docs. 32 and 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Oklahoma for his courtesy in yielding out of order.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS' 40 YEARS OF SAFE WORLDWIDE AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, October 28, Pan American Airways will be 40 years old. I want to take this opportunity to salute Pan American and its great leader, Juan T. Trippe, and congratulate them both for jobs well done.

Pan American is one of the world's greatest airlines—a pioneer and inno-

vator. Its string of "firsts" in scheduled commercial air transportation is envied by other airlines. And because of these "firsts" the air traveler of today enjoys fast, economical, and safe air transportation anywhere in the world.

The inaugural flight that carried the U.S. flag into the international skyways 40 years ago was 25 minutes late in taking off—and for a very good reason. Capt. Hugh Wells, who was to pilot the big Pan American Airways eight-passenger trimotor Fokker F-7 on its maiden voyage from Key West, Fla., to Havana, Cuba, traveled by rail from New York—and the train was late.

However, the flight did get off at 8:25 a.m. on October 28, 1927, from Meacham Field and landed 1 hour and 20 minutes later in Havana. The event was banner headline news in that afternoon's Key West Citizen.

Making up the three-man crew with Wells were Navigator Ed Musick, later famed as master of ocean flying, who blazed many of the air trails across the Pacific, and Engineer John Johnsen.

Pan Am's flight No. 1 landed in the middle of a tropical downpour that forced Cuban officials to shift formal welcoming ceremonies from Camp Columbia to a drier downtown location. There, unhampered by the U.S. prohibition law, the F-7 was christened officially as the *General Machado*, in honor of the Cuban President.

The cargo that day was seven bags of mail and no passengers. Since that time Pan American has flown more than 70 million passengers in its varied and always improving fleet of Pan Am Clippers. From that small Fokker F-7 the Pan Am fleet has grown to more than 130 jet Clippers which traverse 77,818 miles of route

linking 121 cities in 84 countries on six continents. In most cases in these 40 years Juan Trippe has signed the first order for new members of the American aircraft family.

In 1958, Pan Am introduced to the world scheduled jet air service, and it will be the first airline to use the 747 Superjet, in the fall of 1969. Pan Am was also the first airline to order a supersonic airliner—the Anglo-French Concorde—and has placed orders for 15 American-flag SST's to be produced by the Boeing Co.

On September 19 of this year the most recent pioneering program of Pan American was unveiled by Juan T. Trippe, founder of the airline, who now serves as Pan Am's chairman and chief executive officer. He announced that Pan Am's board of directors had approved a final agreement between the airline and the Port of New York Authority whereby Pan Am would operate and develop two airports in the Metropolitan New York area for private and business aircraft. The airports are Teterboro, in Teterboro, N.J., and Republic, in Farmingdale, N.Y.

The objective of the new program is to provide alternate accommodations for business aircraft and air taxis and thus reduce air traffic delays at Kennedy International, La Guardia, and Newark Airports. Again Pan Am is proving a leader in the business of moving people swiftly, comfortably and safely in the bustle and congestion of our fast-paced world.

AIR CARGO AFTER 40 YEARS

Pan Am, under Trippe's strong leadership, has been an innovator in the field of air cargo too. Its first Clipper cargo warehouse at Miami, Fla., in 1951 contained only a battered wooden desk, its top piled with a carton of baby chicks, a few cans of newsreel film and a small cardboard box of auto parts.

Today Pan American maintains the largest and most sophisticated air freight terminal in the world. Costing more than \$8½ million Pan Am's vast cargo building at Kennedy International Airport in New York City contains more than 230,000 square feet of warehouse space which is crammed with packages, bales, pallets, conveyor systems, moving tracks, and electronic controlled consoles.

This new building and the new concepts Pan Am has developed in freight processing, will enable it to keep pace with the worldwide anticipated cargo growth rate over the next 10 years—nine times greater than today.

Pan Am's freighters have flown more than 100 million cargo ton-miles, accounting for 12 percent of the airline's total operating revenues. These impressive figures document Pan Am's active interest in the movement of freight by air and its determination to improve this concept of freight movement.

Pan American World Airways' 747 Superjet Clippers capable of carrying more than 350 passengers will be powered by four Pratt & Whitney JT9D turbofan engines, each weighing 8,339 pounds. Each engine of the superjet will weigh nearly as much as a fully-loaded Fokker F-7 which made Pan American's inaugural flight between Key West and

Havana on October 28, 1927. The F-7's maximum gross takeoff weight was 9,700 pounds.

New York and Buenos Aires are linked in about 10½ nonstop flying hours today by the Jet Clippers of Pan American World Airways, compared to a 7-day, 40-stop journey when Pan Am first began flying to Buenos Aires nearly 40 years ago.

Each one of the over 350 passenger Boeing 747 Superjets which Pan American will begin flying in 1969 will cost in the neighborhood of \$21 million. For this amount, the airline could have bought a fleet of 465 Fokker F-7 trimotor planes with which Pan Am inaugurated U.S. flag international air service 40 years ago, on October 28, 1927. Pan Am has ordered 25 of the giant superjets.

An airlift of about 40 million revenue passenger-miles a day currently is being flown by the round-the-world Jet Clippers of Pan Am. This represents more passenger-miles each day than Pan Am flew during the first 4 years of its existence.

Mr. President, again I salute and congratulate Pan American, its devoted employees, and its remarkable chairman and chief executive officer, Mr. Juan Trippe. I wish them every success during the next four decades of growth in the field of air transportation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for placing in the RECORD the remarkable history of our first international air carrier of passengers and freight. I think that company has done a splendid job. I should like to be associated with the remarks of the Senator.

Mr. President, the State of Florida has felt peculiarly close to this carrier. The Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned the fact that the first international flight of Pan Am originated in Key West, Fla., and went to an airport in Cuba some miles outside the city of Havana about 40 years ago.

The Senator from Florida was not able to take part in that flight. I did, however, take part in the flight 20 years later that commemorated that flight and that was the subject of ceremonies both at Key West and at the Havana Airport. That flight was recognized by the then friendly government in Cuba as being a commemoration of a very great service rendered to them, as well as to us.

The Pan American company, its officers and employees have been good citizens of Miami. I think their first great headquarters for international carriage was there. We value them, and they have been real contributors to the growth of that area as well as to the advancement of aviation and air travel and air passenger service. And above and beyond that, I think in the whole Pan American area they have been a force for the making of better relations and kind understandings between our Latin American friends and ourselves.

Through their subordinate companies they have erected hotels in various Latin

American countries, and those hotels are recognized with great pride by those countries as being among their finest places of hospitality. So far as I am concerned, I think this company has been a great force in the building of good will toward our Nation throughout this hemisphere, and I am sure that is true elsewhere. However, I happen to know about it in this hemisphere.

I am glad that we can place this commendation and recognition of a fine record of a fine organization in the RECORD of the Senate of the United States.

I thank my distinguished colleague for his service and for yielding to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his comments.

I covered aviation during its early, fledgling days while I was a newspaper reporter. Some 35 years ago, I went to Florida to see if it was possible for a plane to come over the ocean from a distant continent.

My wife and I waited patiently for an hour or two at the then marine terminus of the line from South America, and while we waited, the sky was brilliantly sunlit as it always is in that part of the country, and we saw a speck appear at a great distance away in the sky. As that speck drew nearer, it looked like two planes flying together. It turned out to be a huge flying boat with a capacity of perhaps less than 10 passengers, coming from South America.

I was awed by the space which the plane had captured on a regular, routine basis. I have felt ever since that the great day in transportation will always be in the air and that the progress we can make today with our subsonic jets and jumbo jets and giant cargo planes is only the beginning and that we will continue to shrink this globe so that continents such as Australia, when we have a supersonic transport, will be as close to us as California is today; and the Far East, which seems so far, will be moved 10,000 miles closer by the great speed which our magnificent, vast-ranging, long-distance, supersonic planes will soon be able to achieve on the air routes of the world.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to a development in respect of a very powerful controversy regarding Vietnam which has been raging in this country.

The morning news, in my judgment, is featured by the policy statement of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam, to which former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman adhere, and of which the cochairmen are former Senator Douglas, of Illinois, and Gen. Omar Bradley, a great American hero of World War II.

Mr. President, it seems to me, first speaking of the affirmative, that the moderates in this Chamber, who have traditionally been in and of the mainstream of our national life, should very much welcome the formation of this committee.

I, for one, like very much their policy

statement, and it certainly has a most distinguished group of subscribers from almost every State in the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement, together with a list of its subscribers, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I said that I would speak of the positive first, because the center or moderate position in this country has fared badly in recent months, particularly on the issue of Vietnam. We have witnessed a progressive escalation of bitterness and extremist rhetoric and even some civil disobedience. Unhappily, as we saw in Washington and in other places, including college campuses and draft headquarters throughout the United States, peaceful demonstrations turned at times to ugly violence. For this reason, it is particularly important that a most distinguished group of private citizens has come to the rescue of moderation and has given voice to the feelings and beliefs of the great centrist body of opinion in the United States. The policy statement of the citizens committee gave much needed articulation to the fundamental principles and attitudes which grow out of the very conscience of our people.

Mr. President, the committee made it clear that it was going to be "supporters of the office of the Presidency," and it said:

We are not supporters of a President or of an administration.

I hope the committee will persevere in that view, because if it does, I believe it can be very helpful. But if it becomes an apologist for the administration, it will lose its influence. It is for that reason that I wish to point out what the policy statement did not cover.

It was silent, in fact, on the crucial issues which most trouble the American people with regard to Vietnam. The statement's color, its climate, its general thrust are excellent. But the committee must come to grips, if it is really to serve the American people with the questions that are deeply troubling the American people, and these questions are the following:

First. Bombing policy. Question: Is it worthwhile to establish an unconditional cessation of bombing, and will that actually bring on the beginning of negotiation?

Second. What is the role of the United Nations and the Geneva accords in the search for a Vietnam settlement? The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], yesterday introduced a resolution urging our Government to put this matter before the U.N.; and the resolution has the backing of 55 Members of the Senate.

Third. The committee's policy statement is silent on the crucial issue of establishing a relationship, a criterion, between self-help by the South Vietnamese—their Government, their people, and their army, now that they have a legitimately elected government—and how long we stand there and how much

we sacrifice. What the American people want to know is, Is this our war or their war? Originally, it started as their war, and to many of us it appears that it is now becoming our war, and we are trying to stop that trend.

Fourth. The statement is rather quiet about the responsibility of the Presidency, as an office, in inspiring the confidence and faith of the American people so that this leadership may be relied upon in a war—and the country is involved in a war.

These issues, upon which the statement is silent, I have no doubt, will receive clarification and attention by the committee in the days ahead, so that they can do the most good for the American people and deal with the most immediately vexing problems.

I, too, could subscribe to the statement, and perhaps most Senators in the Chamber could do so without any problem. But it still would not answer the basic questions I have raised. It is important that we answer these questions for the American people now.

This past summer marked a great shift in public attitude about the Vietnam war. Despite the murkiness, the obscurity, and the ambiguity of many aspects of our commitment and our role in the Vietnam struggle, the great moderate and centrist majority in this country and in this Chamber for years conceded the benefit of the doubt to the administration so far as our involvement in Vietnam is concerned. This was a traditional and vital American act of faith, one of the seldom-spoken-of basic assumptions and premises of our system. In time of war, in time of crisis, we close ranks; and we want to give and are accustomed to giving the benefit of any doubt to the President and to his senior advisers. But this act of faith, with which we are very familiar, has been put in question with regard to Vietnam. This has brought to the fore the basic issue regarding the office of the Presidency, to which even the committee—though it was not dealing with that subject—had to give some attention in its statement.

No issue is of greater importance to the security and well-being of our Nation than is this one. Let us make it plain, once again, that the integrity of the Office of the President is not and should not be a partisan issue. On the contrary, the erosion of prestige in that office is a matter of vital concern for the loyal opposition, the Republicans, as well.

Mr. President, the real problem in this situation is posed exactly there: I consider it to be the proper role or responsible Republicans to tell the President not to wait for the next campaign, but to tell the President now—as I have tried to do, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], who is in the Chamber, has tried to do, as other Senators have tried to do—what we think about his course, how we think it can be corrected, in order to preserve that prestige, that integrity, in the office of the Presidency which it is to the interest of every American, without regard to party, to preserve. I do not believe any responsible Member of the Senate, regardless of party, would want to detract one iota from the prestige of

the Presidential office in such trying times. But it is the President, himself, who has all those abundant powers of his office. It is his to act. It is the President himself who can do the most either to enhance the prestige of his office or to diminish it. No one else has the command of the media and the attention of the American people.

The real difficulty in this situation is that the American people have become worried about whether the situation in Vietnam is really being handled in terms of the prestige and faith which they place in the authority of the Presidency.

The committee can be very valuable to all of us in that regard. I have given my views before on why we should submit this issue to the U.N. I hope we will submit to the U.N. I hope we will implement an unconditional cessation of bombing when there is a proper diplomatic framework for it—a framework which I am confident could be established by aggressive diplomacy—which will bring about peace negotiations.

Beyond everything else, and beyond the fact that we must condition our continuing in Vietnam on what the Vietnamese do for themselves, we must not take over this war and make it our war as if Vietnam were a colony.

But the main point today is not that. The most important question is what the committee can do. I think it can do a great deal if it really wishes to help the country. I hope very much that it will not consider itself to be—and it says it will not be—an apologist for the President, for a President, or for an administration. Instead, I hope it will do its utmost to uphold the office of the Presidency and address itself promptly to the nettling and vexing questions which I have described.

I do not know what the committee's answers will be, but I believe it would render valuable service to the country if it gave answers, whatever they may be, because it is so eminent and well starred a group.

Mr. President, another point of view was also reflected in this morning's press. That is the idea that maybe we should have a declaration of war, and that maybe this would have an effect upon curbing demonstrators and others who might disagree on the question of Vietnam.

The citizens committee is of enormous potential help in that its policy statement specifically affirms and supports the right of opponents of our national policy to criticize our efforts and to offer alternatives consistent with our national interest.

Mr. President, it might be distasteful, but Americans do have the right to object. It is deplorable to assume that patriotism requires that one always agree with our policies. I would be the first vigorously to uphold law and order and insist that dissenters respect duly constituted authority and follow the channels established in law for expression of dissent. But dissent itself I would not wish to shut off.

I thoroughly disagree with any suggestion of a declaration of war. I hope we do not do it. It would guarantee an escalation of the situation to a realm far

beyond where it is—or is otherwise likely to go.

The important thing is to speak out now, as this committee is speaking out, for the moderate position of assuring dissent and discussion, and not being apologists for any position, even the position of the President, while respecting the Presidency.

I hope very much we will not have a declaration of war, that we will not have a suppression of dissent, and that we will not equate dissent with treason or other conduct against the security of the United States, provided it is lawful dissent.

I hope the citizens committee will help the American people in some of these vexing and highly controversial questions which the American people have to decide. The Nation needs and wants the advice and the views of so eminent and distinguished a group as is gathered under the banner of the Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

TEXT OF A POLICY STATEMENT ISSUED TODAY BY THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

We are a group of concerned citizens who seek peace with freedom in Vietnam.

We do so in the conviction that our own vital national interests are at stake in that troubled land. We are not ashamed to admit that our primary motivation is self-interest—the self-interest of our own country in this shrinking world. America cannot afford to let naked aggression or the suppression of freedom go unchallenged. To Americans, peace and freedom are inseparable.

Our committee is national and nonpartisan—it is composed of Democrats, Republicans and independents, and of "liberals," "moderates" and "conservatives" drawn from all sections and all sectors of our country.

CONCERN WITH PRINCIPLE

We believe in the great American principle of civilian control and a civilian Commander in Chief. And we strongly support our commitment in Vietnam and the policy of non-compromising, although limited, resistance to aggression. All four of the post-World War II American Presidents—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—have proclaimed America's basic purpose of defending freedom. We are not supporters of a President or of an Administration; we are supporters of the office of the Presidency.

As a committee, we shall strive to stay above partisan politics, political personalities and transitory opinion polls. Our concern is not with politics or popularity, but with principle.

We are opposed to surrender, however camouflaged. Yet nothing we advocate can be interpreted as unnecessarily risking a general war in Asia or a nuclear war in the world. We favor a sensible road between capitulation and the indiscriminate use of raw power.

A SMALL COUNTRY

We believe that, in this, we speak for the great "silent center" of American life, the understanding, independent and responsible men and women who have consistently opposed rewarding international aggressors from Adolf Hitler to Mao Tse-tung. And we believe that the "silent center" should now be heard.

A great test is taking place in Vietnam—that test is whether or not the rulers of one territory can cheaply and safely impose a government and a political system upon their neighbors by internal subversion, insurrection, infiltration and invasion. These are

the tactics of the Communist "wars of liberation," which depend for success upon achieving their goals at an endurable price and a bearable risk.

Our objective in Vietnam is to make the price too high and the risk too great for the aggressor. This is why we fight.

Vietnam is a small country and we Americans had little contact with it until after World War II. It still seems isolated and remote to many of us, although all of our Presidents for 30 years have had to concern themselves with our national interests in East Asia. For better perspective, we must turn our sights to the edge of East Asia, that enormous area of peninsulas and islands from Korea and Japan south to Taiwan and the Philippines, then west across Southeast Asia to Burma, then southeast to Malaysia, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand.

That area contains 370 million people—approximately twice the population of the United States. Each of these nations is different from the others but they have one thing in common—all of them are free from external domination. Will this be true if we abandon Vietnam? Or will Peking and Hanoi, flushed with success, continue their expansionist policy through many other "wars of liberation," each conducted at a price which they can endure and a risk which they can bear? We believe they would.

LOUD AND CLEAR

Never in over a century has there been as much loud and violent opposition expressed in America to a conflict in which our fighting men are heavily and heroically engaged. However, we are concerned that voices of dissent have, thus far, received attention far out of proportion to their actual numbers. Our committee specifically affirms and supports the right of opponents of our national policy to criticize that effort and to offer alternatives consistent with our national interest and security.

Our objective as a committee is not to suppress the voices of such opposition. Our objective is to make sure that the majority voice of America is heard—loud and clear—so that Peking and Hanoi will not mistake the strident voices of some dissenters for American discouragement and a weakening of will. And, at the same time, we want to give renewed assurance to our fighting men that their sacrifices are neither in vain nor unappreciated—or unwanted—by the great bulk of their fellow citizens.

We want the aggressors to know that there is a solid, stubborn, dedicated, bipartisan majority of private citizens in America who approve our country's policy of patient, responsible, determined resistance which is dependent for its success on having the enemy realize that we shall keep the pressure on and not back down, that the peace we insist upon is a peace with freedom and, thus, with honor.

Today, America is a great world power, shedding its blood and expending its treasure in a distant country for the simple privilege of withdrawing in peace as soon as that country is guaranteed the effective right of self-determination. We ask nothing for ourselves and insist upon nothing for South Vietnam except that it be free to chart its own future, no matter what course it may choose. Surely this is a noble and worthy objective consistent with all that is best in American life and tradition.

Our committee has been formed to rally and articulate the support of the concerned, independent thinking, responsible citizens in America who favor our nation's fundamental commitment to peace with freedom.

Will you join with us?

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM IN VIETNAM

Truman, Harry S.—33d President of the United States.

Eisenhower, Dwight D.—34th President of the United States.

Acheson, Dean—Former Secretary of State.
Alexander, Holmes—Syndicated columnist.
Arnold, Thurman—Former Assistant Attorney General in charge of Antitrust Division.

Bandler, Ned—Business executive.
Barnett, Frank R.—President, National Strategy Information Center, Inc.

Baron, Murray—Industrial consultant.
Beirne, Joseph W.—President, Communications Workers of America.

Bradley, General of the Army Omar N.—Former chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Breit, Dr. Gregory—Donner Professor of Physics, Yale University.

Brown, Dr. J. Douglas—Professor of Economics, Princeton University. Former dean of the faculty.

Brown, Edmund G.—Former Governor of California.

Burns, Dr. James MacGregor—James Phinney Baster Professor of History and Public Affairs and chairman, Department of Political Science, Williams College.

Byrnes, James F.—Former Secretary of State.

Cabot, Thomas D.—Chairman of the Board, Cabot Corporation, Boston. Former director, Office of International Security Affairs, Department of State.

Cherne, Leo—Executive director, the Research Institute of America, Inc.

Clay, Gen. Lucius D.—Senior partner, Lehman Brothers.

Conant, Dr. James B.—Former president, Harvard University. Former Ambassador to Germany.

Connelly, Marc—Playwright.

Darden, Colgate—Former president, University of Virginia.

Davis, Thurston N., S.J.—Editor in chief, America.

Douglas, Paul H.—Former Senator from Illinois.

Draper, Gen. William H.—Partner, Draper, Gaither & Anderson.

Drummond, Roscoe—Syndicated columnist.

Ellison, Ralph—Author.

Emmett, Christopher—Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

Engel, Irving M.—Attorney-at-law. Past president, American Jewish Committee.

Farland, Joseph S.—Former ambassador to the Dominican Republic and to the Republic of Panama.

Farrell, James T.—Author.

Fisher, John M.—President, American Research Foundation, Chicago.

Gaston, A. G.—President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Company, Birmingham.

Gates, Thomas S.—Chairman, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, former Secretary of Defense.

Gideonse, Dr. Harry D.—Chancellor, New School for Social Research.

Gullion, Dr. Edmund A.—Dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Gunderson, Mrs. Robert—Former Civil Service Commissioner.

Hacker, Louis M.—Historian and professor of economics, Columbia University.

Handlin, Dr. Oscar—Director, Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History, Harvard University.

Hanes, John W. Jr.—Investment banker, Former Assistant Secretary of State.

Harris, Dr. Huntington—Business executive.

Hecht, Rabbi Abraham B.—President, Rabbinical Alliance of America.

Hoffer, Eric—Author and longshoreman.

Jones, Dr. Frank—Physician and surgeon.

Keeler, W. W.—President, Phillips Petroleum Company.

Keggi, Dr. Kristaps J.—Assistant professor of orthopedic surgery, Yale University.

King, Wilson—Farmer.

Lapp, Dr. Ralph E.—Nuclear physicist and author.

Lieberman, Morris I.—Attorney-at-law, Chicago.

De Lima, Oscar—Business executive, Chairman, executive committee, United Nations Association.

Lindsay, Howard—Playwright, producer and actor.

Locke, Edwin Allen Jr.—President, Modern Homes Construction Company.

Lodge, George C.—University official, Former Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Loomis, Henry—Former director, Voice of America.

Lord, Mrs. Oswald B.—Former United States representative on Human Rights Commission, United Nations.

Lucey, Archbishop Robert E.—San Antonio prelate.

McCaleb, Claude B.—Book company executive.

McDougal, Myres C.—Sterling Professor of Law, Yale University.

McGill, Ralph—Syndicated columnist.

Marshall, Brig. Gen. S. L. A.—Military historian.

Martin, C. V.—President, Carson Pirie Scott & Co.

Meany, George—President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Michael, Franz—Associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University.

Nash, Dr. Philifo—Consulting anthropologist, Former Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Nevins, Allan—Historian.

Newman, Ralph G.—Author, publisher and columnist.

Randall, Mrs. Ann Hagen—Television producer and former foreign correspondent.

Reid, Whitelaw—Business executive.

Robinson, Prof. James A.—Director, Mershon Center for Education in National Security, Ohio State University.

Roosevelt, Kermit—President, Kermit Roosevelt & Associates.

Rose, Dr. Frank—President, University of Alabama.

Rowe, James H. Jr.—Former assistant to President Roosevelt and former Assistant Attorney General.

Rubin, Rabbi Schuler—New York City.

Sacks, Prof. I. Milton—Dean of the undergraduate school, Brandeis University.

Saltonstall, Leverett—Former Senator from Massachusetts.

Saltzman, Charles E.—Investment banker, Former Under Secretary of State.

Scalapino, Robert A.—Professor of political science, University of California.

Seabury, Dr. Paul—Professor of political science, University of California.

Seitz, Dr. Frederick—President, National Academy of Sciences.

Shuster, Dr. George N.—President emeritus, Hunter College.

Smith, Howard K.—News analyst, commentator and author.

Smithies, Dr. Arthur—Nathaniel Ropes Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.

De Sola Pool, Dr. Ithiel—Professor of political science, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sonne, H. Christian—Chairman, National Planning Association.

Stephens, Charles J.—Student, University of California, Berkeley.

Stout, Rex—Author.

Strauss, Miss Anna Lord—Former president, League of Women Voters of the United States.

Strauss, Lewis L.—Former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Stulberg, Louis—President, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

Swearingen, Rodger—Professor of interna-

tional relations, University of Southern California.

Swig, Benjamin H.—Chairman of the board, Fairmont Hotel Company.

Tatum, E. L. Dr.—Nobel laureate in medicine and physio-Professor, Rockefeller University.

Taylor, Prof. George E.—Director, Far Eastern and Russian Institute, University of Washington.

Thacher, James—Attorney-at-law.

Trager, Frank N.—Professor of international affairs, New York University.

Tyroler, Charles 2d—President, Quadri-Science, Inc.

Urey, Dr. Harold C.—Nobel laureate in chemistry. Professor of chemistry at large, University of California.

Van Dusen, Dr. Henry P.—Clergyman, educator and author. Chairman, Foundation for Theological Education in Southeast Asia.

Washburn, Abbott—Former deputy director, United States Information Agency.

White, Robert P.—Student, University of Oklahoma.

Whitney, John Hay—Former ambassador to Britain.

Wigner, Eugene P.—Nobel laureate in physics. Professor of physics, Princeton University.

Williams, T. Harry—Boyd Professor of History, Louisiana State University.

Wilson, Joseph C.—Chairman of the board, Xerox Corporation.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New York. In his customary eloquent and articulate way he has summed up the case. I share his view about the formation of this committee. I may not be in agreement with them, but I think it is a great thing for our country and it offers a great opportunity. I think the Senator from New York has put the question in a proper perspective.

Mr. President, I trust the remarks which the Senator from New York made so eloquently will be brought home to the people of our beloved country.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague for his enormous and legendary experience in this field. I feel tremendously fortified by his approval.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4903) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the further report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the further report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses

on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in its issue of yesterday, October 25, the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., one of our leading newspapers, there is published an editorial which I think is well worthy of consideration.

The editorial relates to the use by a relatively small number of Communists as participators of such peace demonstrations, so-called, and antidraft demonstrations as have been going on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial entitled "It Is Time To Clamp Down" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS TIME TO CLAMP DOWN

There is an utterly incomprehensible indifference, indeed blindness, displayed in national political circles toward Communist use of the so-called "peace" demonstrations.

This blindness is more than irritating. It is dangerous.

Some attribute the phenomenon to the fact that political liberals in many instances still retain a fear of "red baiting" as part of the nation's hangover from McCarthyism. But this is ridiculous in the extreme.

It would be patently absurd to ignore forever afterward the existence of a disease called typhoid fever because several cases of some other malady were wrongly diagnosed as typhoid. Every bit as absurd is the tendency now not to see Communist influence when it is as apparent as Castro's beard.

The American people have been asked over the years to swallow a lot of incredible contentions, but Dr. Benjamin Spock's "guess" that in the throng of people who perpetrated the demonstration and violence in Washington, D.C. over the weekend "there were a couple dozen Communists" strains belief beyond reason.

"I don't feel we are being used by the Communists," said the baby doctor who spends much of his time demonstrating against the Vietnam War.

About two weeks before the demonstration, The Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in the United States, carried a story headlined "Support Zooming for Peace March in Washington."

The story in The Worker, read primarily by Communists, gave detailed information on special transportation arrangements from New York City to Washington for the rally.

For weeks the paper urged its readers to participate in the demonstration.

All of this to place "a couple of dozen Communists" in a throng of some 50,000? Nonsense!

Like it or not, the United States of America is in a war in Southeast Asia and America's young men are dying from artillery shells, missiles, bullets and land mines made in Russia and China.

This is no time for permissiveness and just plain lethargy on the home front toward those domestic Communists who are attempting to foment rioting here at home in order to give the Reds a political victory they cannot win in the field and to mock the sacrifice made by the members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The right of peaceful dissent is vital to

democracy and must be preserved. Those who don't approve of the war have every right to speak out. But mob violence and Red subversion must be stopped.

America has investigative resources to ferret out the Communists in the peace movement and separate them from those whose motive may be sincere opposition to the war.

It is doubtful that America has the legal machinery to do an effective job of prosecuting the Communists and there has been no strong expression from the administration of the will to crack down and crack down hard.

Congress must provide this legal machinery quickly and it appears that it is left to the Congress to provide leadership to steps which will put a stop to this mockery of freedom.

While on the subject, Congress should also take strong steps to curb the latest announced intention of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Leaders of the movement have said it will turn from demonstrations as a tactic to active resistance through confrontations with the government by sit-ins and civil disobedience.

This is simply not to be tolerated. We have had enough. The contrast between some bearded lout blocking the door to an induction center and a young American Marine waiting for the next artillery round to drop upon Con Thien is too great to be borne.

This situation is a national disgrace.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to read just a few paragraphs from this editorial to which I have referred:

There is an utterly incomprehensible indifference, indeed blindness, displayed in national political circles toward Communist use of the so-called peace demonstrations.

This blindness is more than irritating. It is dangerous.

Mr. President, I am calling this matter particularly to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary. After appealing to the Congress to take action, this editorial concludes as follows:

Congress must provide this legal machinery quickly and it appears that it is left to the Congress to provide leadership to steps which will put a stop to this mockery of freedom.

While on the subject, Congress should also take strong steps to curb the latest announced intention of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

Leaders of the movement have said it will turn from demonstrations as a tactic to active resistance through confrontations with the government by sit-ins and civil disobedience.

This is simply not to be tolerated. We have had enough. The contrast between some bearded lout blocking the door to an induction center and a young American Marine waiting for the next artillery round to drop upon Con Thien is too great to be borne.

This situation is a national disgrace.

Mr. President, I respectfully call the editorial and its subject matter to the attention of our able Committee on the Judiciary with the strong request that appropriate legislation be considered and brought out quickly for action by Congress.

CONGRESS WILL NOT BE INTIMIDATED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, following the demonstrators' march on the Pentagon, Dr. Martin Luther King was quoted in the press as declaring that the time may come for staging a massive camp-in to disrupt the Nation's Capital if Congress does not act soon on programs for the poor. To

prod Congress, he said, more than 1-day demonstrations may be needed.

To quote Dr. King from the press reports, he said:

Just camp here and stay here by the thousands and thousands . . . and make it clear that the city will not function. The civil rights movement has a responsibility to "pressure" Congress so that it can "no longer elude our demands."

Mr. President, if the only way the supporters of a cause can impress the Congress is by threats to disrupt the National Government, then it would appear to me that their cause does not have much merit. Leaders who can think of nothing else than demonstrations, who insist on thinking and acting negatively instead of constructively, are dangerously close to a bankruptcy of ideas.

Dr. King's threats do not impress me, and I do not believe they will impress many other Members of the Senate and House. The effect, instead, I think, will be to alienate both the Congress and the public. I, for one, think we have enough of this kind of demonstration.

In this connection, the Washington Post in its editorial entitled "King's Camp-In" today makes the excellent point that a minority should be heard, but not at the expense and exclusion of the millions of other citizens who do not join in its demands.

The editorial states:

Those who conjure up mobs to force the suspension of Government itself are talking about revolution—even if they call it "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience."

I agree with its conclusion that Congress may have its faults, but Dr. King must know that its Members are not so pusillanimous as to be intimidated by any threat he may make of a camp-in to bring the Government to a halt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING'S CAMP-IN

It is to be hoped that Dr. Martin Luther King will, on reflection, change his mind about his vague proposal for a massive "camp-in" in Washington to disrupt the Government and compel Congress to act on some programs he wishes to have passed.

A demonstration aimed at the mind and conscience of the country and which incidentally discommodates the operations of Government is one thing. A massive invasion and sit-down that is deliberately contrived and intended to cause the suspension of Government operations is something else. Any real democracy should put up with the inconvenience of the former; and any ordinary government must resist the latter. The first situation constitutes a request that the Government listen to a minority; the second represents a demand that the Government comply with and respond to the dictates of a minority alone. The first is a resort to democracy: the second an appeal to anarchy.

The citizens who have a dissent to voice or a complaint to make have a right to articulate grievances through assembly, demonstration and petition. But they have no right to demand that Government suspend operations until it yields to their importunate demands. The people who take to the streets should be heard; but they should not be heard to the exclusion of the millions of citizens who do not join the

mob in the streets. Those who conjure up mobs to force the suspension of Government itself are talking about revolution—even if they call it "passive resistance" or "civil disobedience."

Congress may have its faults, but Dr. King has good reason to know that its members are not so pusillanimous that they can be intimidated into action. To attempt that sort of intimidation is to invite, instead, a reaction even from those broadly sympathetic to Dr. King's larger purposes.

DETROIT'S MAYOR CAVANAGH FORESAW THE DISTURBANCES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the other body has recently reported to the floor a bill to continue the war on poverty for the remainder of this fiscal year. It is anticipated that the bill will come to the floor for debate within the next few weeks.

There has appeared to be in the other body some disenchantment with the poverty program which, in my opinion, does not reflect either the facts of the matter or the opinion of a majority of the American people.

For some time, I have been accumulating evidence to support what I have just said and in a few moments I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD, along with a few comments, the various data dealing with the subject.

The first is a comment by the very able and distinguished mayor of Detroit, Jerome Cavanagh, having reference to the unfortunate riots of last summer in his great city.

Mr. President, over and over again in recent months, newspapers and magazines have started feature articles with such phrases as "Detroit was the city they said it couldn't happen in" and "No one believed it could ever happen in New Haven."

But it did happen in Detroit and in New Haven, and in more than 40 other cities across the country.

Gone today and, I believe, gone forever are the smugness and complacency we wrapped ourselves in before the summer winds of hate and fury blew through our cities. Smugness and complacency have been replaced by soul searching and sober realism.

But long before this summer's holocausts we did have prophets, men of vision and understanding, among our city officials. They saw the ominous signs and portents and warned the American people; but for the most part their warnings were ignored. We see now that we did not want to confront the consequences of our collective neglect, apathy, and inertia. We have paid—this summer—a tragic price for that refusal to face realities. I hope that we will not pay that price again. I hope that the other body will see to it that we do not.

Ironically, one of the prophets to whom we did not listen, and should have, was the mayor of Detroit, the highly competent and farsighted Jerome Cavanagh. Mayor Cavanagh indulged in no wishful thinking; he refused to see the world only through rose-colored glasses. With penetrating insight, Mayor Cavanagh saw clearly that it could happen in Detroit and that it could happen in other cities.

If we had listened to our prophets, to Mayor Cavanagh and the others who sounded the alarms, we might have avoided much of the devastation, bloodshed, and pillage that raged through our communities in this fateful summer.

Mr. President, in this connection, I recently received an illuminating letter from Mayor Cavanagh which I would like to share with Members of this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you for sending me your statement on "Civil Disorders in American Cities," as published in the August 2 Congressional Record.

This has been a trying time for us all. As you know, a year ago, I told the Ribicoff Committee, "We must make sure that everyone in this nation begins to think about the larger questions—begins to realize that the warfare on our city streets is as important to our national destiny as some consider the warfare in Southeast Asia."

This same theme was echoed in my presidential address to the National League of Cities last November.

In 1963, I warned the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials at their national convention that cities face a tragic situation that is nothing less than a national shame.

Last November, I told the Conference of National Organizations that "our treatment of the Negro has been a national disgrace. Our laws, our customs and our attitudes are changing now. I only hope they change fast enough to match the impatience of so many forgotten Americans."

And, again in April before the National Institute of Public Affairs, I warned that everything in this nation is not going to be all right. My words that night were, "I do not mean to preach blood and thunder here tonight. But there is a good deal of thunder that can be heard and blood has already spilled."

Since that night in April, much more blood has spilled—a large portion of it in Detroit.

As I told the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Detroit has done all the textbook things and, according to all available scales, has run one of the most successful Wars on Poverty in the nation while generally moving the city forward.

But this apparently is not enough. We knew this before the riot but now have had our convictions confirmed by the violence directed at society by those forced to live in the ghettos. These people have shared the experience of slum living—the overall conditions of degradation, disorganization and poverty in which the young grow up without hope of legitimately sharing in the supposed fruits of the affluent society—that affluent society within their sight but beyond their reach.

Now we must go beyond the textbook and create new ways to meet these problems. I agree with you that these new methods must be undertaken, of course, in the spirit of justice, but primarily in the spirit of compassion and cooperation.

We are making a new start in Detroit. We are looking to Washington for assistance.

It is not enough to learn how to control and put down civil disorders. We must eliminate the causes for civil disorders.

Your help and good wishes are much appreciated.

Sincerely,

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the mayor was responding to a statement entitled "Civil Disorders in American Cities" as published in the August 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I had sent to him. He points out the testimony he gave before the Ribicoff committee over a year before his letter was sent to me, in which he indicated the necessity to begin to think about the larger questions, that warfare on our city streets is as important to our national destiny as the war in Southeast Asia.

He points out that he warned the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials at their national convention in 1963 that our cities faced a tragic situation, and that such a tragic situation was nothing less than a national shame. He made similar comments in April 1966, and again in November 1966. But his warnings went unheeded. The riots hit Detroit and 30 other cities.

He also points out that we must now go beyond reading about matters of this sort in textbooks, that we must create new ways to meet these problems in the spirit of justice, and also in the spirit of compassion and cooperation. He ends his letter by saying:

It is not enough to learn how to control and put down civil disorders. We must eliminate the causes for civil disorders.

OEO BACKED BY INDUSTRY, BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is an impression abroad that the war on poverty bill, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, approved by the Senate, is legislation principally supported by the administration and by liberals and labor, a notion that has been given currency by editorial comment in a number of conservative newspapers and magazines.

But the truth is that the bill passed by the Senate which, in many ways, is very different from the bill recommended by the OEO, enjoys the confidence and support of a wide spectrum of the business community. This was emphasized recently when the Urban Coalition announced its vigorous support of the Emergency Employment Act which, I regret, was rejected on the floor of the Senate "as a significant step toward an urgently needed national emergency program to provide at least 1 million jobs."

Prominent among members of the steering committee of the urban coalition are such representatives of big business and industry as Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co.; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric; J. Irwin Miller, chairman, Cummins Engine Co.; Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board, Time, Inc.; and Theodore Schlesinger, president, Allied Stores Corp.

More recently, Mr. President, we were given fresh evidence that thoughtful members of the business community view the Office of Economic Opportunity as an operation that deserves respect and support. Large display advertisements have appeared in the New York Times and the Washington Post strongly en-

dorsing the OEO and its various programs and stating with heavy emphasis:

The OEO must be preserved as the single responsible agency for the conduct and management of the many and diverse activities of the economic opportunity program.

The theme of this timely published statement is "A Hand Up—Not a Hand-out. That's What OEO Is All About."

I ask unanimous consent that the impressive text of what the businessmen and industrialists have to say about OEO and its work may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We believe that businessmen, professional, legislators, indeed all citizens should understand and support the Office of Economic Opportunity. For what it does, as well as for how it does it.

OEO's programs have always made sense. But this summer's tragic events in numerous cities, we are convinced, make OEO's programs imperative. In city after city, these programs have prevented or reduced community conflict. They provided hope where there had been only despair, dialogue where there had been only division, skills where there had been none.

What does the OEO do? We look at it this way: The OEO and its programs give people a hand up, not a handout . . . get people off relief rolls and onto payrolls. Private payrolls. It helps people move up the economic ladder; equips them through education and training to become productive and constructive members of society. The way we see it, the OEO turns out workers and consumers.

Now, how does the OEO operate? It's set up and run like any efficient organization should be. A central management governing and administering a variety of diverse programs in 1100 communities in all 50 states, plus 120 Job Corps Centers. The OEO runs tightly, cleanly, economically. And it does this largely because of the way it's organized.

Operationally, the OEO follows the proven management concept of single responsibility. We practice this principle within our own organizations. And therefore, it's only natural for us to believe that the OEO must be preserved as the single responsible agency for the conduct and management of the many and diverse activities of the economic opportunity program.

It is the best way to get a vital job done.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that statement is certainly an unequivocal declaration of approval and advocacy of what the OEO is and what it does. As evidence of the wide range of this business and industry approval, I would like to cite some of the executives who signed the statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of these executives may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board, United Artists Corporation.

Ralph M. Besse, President, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Cabell Brand, President, Ortho-Vent Shoe Company.

George R. Brown, President, Brown & Root, Inc.

Holmes Brown, Vice President, American Airlines, Inc.

Carter Burgess, Chairman of the Board, American Machine & Foundry.

Richard H. Carter, President, Fostoria Corporation.

Walker L. Cisler, Chairman, The Detroit Edison Company.

Donald C. Cook, President, American Electric Power Co., Inc.

Richard Cudahy, President, Patrick Cudahy, Inc.

C. Malcolm Davis, President, Fidelity Union Trust Co.

John D. deButts, Vice Chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Dr. A. G. Gaston, President, Booker T. Washington Insurance Co.

James M. Gavin, Chairman of the Board, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Harold S. Geneen, Chairman, International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.

Carl A. Gerstaecker, Chairman of the Board, The Dow Chemical Company.

Eli Goldston, President, Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates.

Jerold C. Hoffberger, President, National Brewing Company.

Harding Lawrence, President, Braniff International.

Frederick Lee, Vice President, Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corporation.

C. Virgil Martin, President, Carson Pirie Scott & Company.

James McCormack, Chairman, Communications Satellite Corporation.

William Patrick, Assistant General Counsel, Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

Harvey Russell, Vice President, Pepsi-Cola Company.

Charles E. Scripps, Chairman of the Board, Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Olcott Smith, Chairman, Aetna Life Insurance Company.

Roger P. Sonnabend, President, Hotel Corporation of America.

W. H. Wheeler, Chairman of the Board, Pitney-Bowes, Inc.

URBAN COALITION IN 50-CITY CAMPAIGN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on the same general subject, nearly 2 months ago a new national organization known as the Urban Coalition held its first convocation in Washington. Approximately 1,200 leaders of business, labor, civil rights, religion, and Government formed a unique alliance organized to launch "a broad public-private attack on the problems of American cities."

Andrew Haskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., and of Urban America, Inc., and A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, were named cochairmen. Elected to the steering committee were such noted and prestigious Americans as: Mayor John V. Lindsay, of New York; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board, General Electric; Henry Ford II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers; the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Roy Wilkins, executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Whitney Young, executive director, National Urban League; Mayor James H. J. Tate, of Philadelphia; Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of Pittsburgh; and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit.

As its initial action, the Urban Coalition adopted a statement of principles, goals and commitments that has been widely publicized and warmly praised. The statement advanced a comprehensive program, but the proposals that captured the greatest attention were those calling for the creation of 1 million jobs and 1 million housing units for low-income families.

Important as this national effort is to the eradication of mass unemployment and municipal blight, even more valuable and necessary are the same kind of broad alliances on local levels. Urban Coalition programs are planned for 50 cities with some of the cities, like New York, concentrating at first on jobs and job-training for unemployed men and women in the city's minority communities. The New York coalition has extremely capable leadership with Christian Herter, Jr., son of the former Governor of Massachusetts and Secretary of State of the United States, serving as chairman and with such outstanding members as General Electric Chairman Phillippe, and President Joseph Curran, of the National Maritime Union, AFL-CIO.

The New York Coalition was given an enthusiastic sendoff by the New York Times. Because the Urban Coalition idea is scheduled to spread to 50 cities, and perhaps more, I feel sure the New York Times' excellent editorial will be of interest to all Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to include the New York Times editorial, "Getting Off the Ground," of October 12, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING OFF THE GROUND

The concern of the Urban Coalition, expressed so strongly late last summer by public-spirited citizens during an emergency post-riot convocation in Washington, is beginning to find footholds where it counts—in the front-line cities of America.

Mobilization of the nation's public and private resources for a vigorous attack on that urban hydra—unemployment, slum housing and aimless education—is getting off the ground. Leaders in some fifty cities will meet in Chicago next week to establish local action groups that can enlist the resources and energies of business, labor, religious, academic and community organizations. In this city, a New York Coalition has just started to translate the lofty policy language of the national steering committee into local terms.

High-mindedness, of course, will not be enough. Hard-core unemployment will take hard-core solutions. Lobbying of superhuman proportions will be required in the business and labor communities to break down traditional attitudes.

The Federal Government is in the forefront of action. For this reason the first step of the local Coalition is to discuss the inclusion of New York City in the pilot program, recently announced by the President, to engage the private sector in the attack on unemployment. But the true effectiveness of the Urban Coalition, the New York Coalition and those to come in other cities will be measured by more than simply seeking increased assistance from Washington.

Municipalities with archaic laws and practices that have effectively barred the poor and disadvantaged from job and housing gains will have to be persuaded to change their cus-

oms. Certain industries that have blocked Negroes from full opportunities will have to be re-educated. Certain unions which have denied membership on racial grounds will have to reform their practices.

By enlisting the community-action groups—the spokesmen for the jobless and ill-housed—the New York Coalition is getting to the core of center city's problems.

ANTIPOVERTY WORKERS PRAISED FOR CALMING RIOT SITUATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again I speak about the splendid record of anti-poverty workers who did so much to calm riot situations in our cities this summer. More and more evidence is accumulating that the country's long, hot summer would have been much hotter and much longer had it not been for the superb work of antipoverty fighters across the country.

In city after city and town after town, mayors and police officials have gone on record praising antipoverty workers for their successful efforts which either prevented violence, arson, and looting or greatly helped diminish them after disturbances broke out.

There were more than 30,000 Community Action employees throughout the country while the riots were in progress, but only 16 were arrested and none convicted. But in 15 cities it has been proved that Community Action agencies calmed down bad situations, and in 14 cities municipal police departments and Community Action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots. And in eight cities the juvenile arrest rate went down this summer as the result of more summer jobs.

Mr. President, there will never be any way of calculating how many lives were saved this summer, how many homes and businesses were preserved from destruction, and how many jobs were safeguarded as a result of the devoted and hazardous labors of such groups as the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We who know the handicaps and disadvantages under which they work are proud of these antipoverty warriors and their accomplishments.

Mr. President, one of the most comprehensive yet concise appraisals of the role played by the antipoverty workers in this summer's upheavals was published recently by the Christian Science Monitor. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 21, 1967]

OEO COOLS RIOT CITIES, PROBE HINTS
(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—The Office of Economic Opportunity has been under siege for weeks.

Every since rioting first erupted, the anti-poverty agency, in the words of one top official, has been "trying to put out fires."

At the same time, the OEO has been the target of repeated accusations.

Most frequent was the charge that anti-poverty workers were involved in the burning and looting.

The agency's public-relations men immediately issued denials. But they winced with

each new outbreak, not knowing for sure what might happen next. And they couldn't be completely certain that in the 28 cities where riots occurred, there might not be some (or even quite a few) of their anti-poverty workers involved. In those cities alone, they knew there are over 12,000 employees being paid by the OEO.

INVESTIGATIONS URGED

The OEO's director, R. Sargent Shriver, had to know the facts quickly.

Sen. John L. McClellan (D) of Arkansas was convinced that the charges were true. So were other lawmakers. Many called for full-scale investigations.

However, on the basis of early soundings, Mr. Shriver reported to the House Committee on Education and Labor that the charges were groundless.

"In Detroit alone," he said, "3,783 persons were arrested. There are 1,547 paid anti-poverty workers in that city but not a single one is under arrest."

He also pointed out, that of the nearly 500 OEO offices in these cities, "not a single one was burned. Not a single one was looted."

"Why? Because . . . these facilities were among the few places where they [the Negroes] could find refuge and aid."

DETAILS SOUGHT

And out of the some 6,700 arrested in the 28 cities, the OEO pointed out, only seven were paid poverty workers.

Mr. Shriver had called on his chief of inspections, former newspaperman Ed May, to dig out the facts. Mr. May sent investigators out to make reports. He needed the facts for his boss.

Other top Shriver aides in charge of program planning, needed to know as well—to guide them in modifying programs that may have gone wrong.

The reports, made available to this newspaper, tell the good and the bad. They point to occasional indiscretion and poor judgment on the part of anti-poverty workers in a few cities.

For example, in Dayton, Ohio, OEO investigators reported that the director of one OEO-funded program had his picture taken with H. (Rap) Brown at the airport and introduced him at a meeting afterward. The disturbance started after this meeting. OEO inspectors felt this was bad judgment, but they found "no evidence of wrongdoing . . . just a lack of tact and common sense."

And in Rochester, N.Y., inspectors found that some anti-poverty officials had "verbally attacked city officials" at a meeting called supposedly to quell tension. The effect was the opposite.

And in many cities poverty workers have appeared as witnesses against the police.

But the major, untold story of the riots is quite different and deeply impressive. It is a story of a constructive response to emergencies by anti-poverty workers in community after community.

In report after report, instance after instance of the courageous role played by these people in the midst of racial chaos remains a singularly bright light in an otherwise dismal picture.

INCIDENTS LISTED

Here are some examples from the investigator's reports:

Detroit: "Neighborhood workers and community organizers circulated through the riot areas, ascertaining what help was needed with regard to shelter, food, and clothing."

"Some 30 Neighborhood Youth Corps youths, serving as police cadets, worked around the clock, in 12-hour shifts at police precincts, manning in-put telephone switchboards, handling all calls requesting general information."

Tampa, Fla.: Two neighborhood anti-poverty centers served as headquarters for a group of young Negroes "assigned to go into

the riot area to talk with teen-agers," to cool them off.

Minneapolis: Some 15 employees of an OEO program "went out on the streets in an attempt to calm rebellious teen-agers. . . ." And the Minneapolis Tribune reported that one anti-poverty center "has been acknowledged by police as a key factor in limiting the violence."

Toledo, Ohio: 25 poverty workers here "maintained the only communication with teen-age rioters. . . ." The poverty workers called most of the youths to a meeting to air their grievances and all-night telephone grievance service was started "for ghetto residents with gripes."

CROWD INTERCEPTED

Grand Rapids, Mich.: The local anti-poverty agency "placed on the street a task force of street workers who sought to help the police prevent looting." The Grand Rapids press praised their work calling them "a group of young Negroes bent on trying to keep Grand Rapids cool."

Plainfield, N.J.: "Before and during the riot, 10 of 12 staff members were on the street, trying to calm the people."

Pontiac, Mich.: "Some 20 neighborhood organizers were utilized to talk to the wayward youth in their areas in attempts to cool things down. . . ."

Saginaw, Mich.: Anti-poverty officials were credited with preventing violence July 25, when they intercepted a crowd marching on City Hall. They convinced the crowd that their grievances could be presented to the Mayor by two spokesmen.

Des Moines: This city has a "night patrol" set up by the anti-poverty program "to keep things cool." The 30 youths in the patrol go to a disturbance "to encourage people on the streets to go to their homes and stay there."

CADETS PRAISED

Atlanta: During a disturbance in the Dixie Hills section of this city, the anti-poverty office was the only facility in the area open. It served as a meeting place for city and state officials with local residents.

Youngstown, Ohio: The Youngstown Vindicator, praising the efforts of the 26 OEO-funded police cadets said: "They calm down a hothead spoiling for a fight or mingle in a crowd urging excited youngsters to go home."

Waterbury, Conn.: The local Community Action Program (CAP) agency "acted as a communications link between the radical elements in the Negro neighborhoods and the white power structure of the city. . . ."

The inspector's reports admitted that in some cities the local anti-poverty programs played little or no role. In Boston's Roxbury section, they reported, "ABCD apparently did not play much of a role in the Roxbury riots, either positively or negatively." And they reported that the Cairo, Ill., CAP "did very little during the trouble."

Similarly, CAPs played little or no part, one way or another, in Lansing, Mich., Waterloo, Iowa, or in Cambridge, Md.

CENTERS CRITICIZED

And the Rochester CAP program came in for some criticism: "The CAP neighborhood centers have not reached the teenagers. In fact, two of the centers don't have a youth worker and the other just recently hired one, even though the money has been appropriated over a year."

Many of these 28 cities have now redoubled their efforts to set up peace-keeping machinery—and the experience with the use of anti-poverty workers has encouraged increase reliance on them.

Probably even more significant is the effort being made by anti-poverty workers to keep calm the cities where no rioting occurred.

OEO inspectors investigated the considerable role OEO-funded agencies are playing in cooling eleven other nonriot cities, includ-

ing these: Elizabeth, N.J., Baton Rouge, La., Oklahoma City, St. Louis, New York, Lowell, Mass., Trenton, N.J., Philadelphia, Charlotte, N.C., Columbus, Ohio, and Dallas.

QUESTIONS REMAIN

While the specific "cool-off" roles of the anti-poverty agencies in these cities were spelled out in detail in the reports, in general, it can be said that the primary emphasis of these efforts is to keep avenues of communication open between the Negroes and the city officials.

"Community Action agencies often offer the only communications link between the ghetto and the power structure that is able to function in times of crisis," the investigators concluded.

While all the questions of the involvement of poverty workers in the rioting is by no means settled by the OEO inspection reports, and congressional investigators are still looking into the charges, one thing is certain:

Anti-poverty agencies often have served as a vital "hot line" to the Negro community deep in the throes of a struggle for economic and social advantages enjoyed by the other 90 percent of this country's population.

The effect of such communication in quelling riots is difficult to estimate.

But, in the words of Providence Mayor Joseph A. Doorley Jr., talking to a group of volunteer OEO workers: "As far as I'm concerned, there is no telling how bad this might have been if it hadn't been for you guys."

PHILADELPHIA'S POVERTY FUNDS INSURE ITS CHILDREN'S FUTURE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again I turn to my own city of Philadelphia. I believe our country is learning an all-important lesson taught by the Founding Fathers, a lesson concerning the responsibility of one generation for those that follow.

Thomas Paine put it this way:

The declaration which says that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children is contrary to every principle of moral justice.

Because of men like Paine and Jefferson, we have abandoned the superstition that human beings are predestined to their lots, that because a father is impoverished the children too are doomed to penury.

Today we believe not only that children born to poverty-stricken parents do not need to grow up in deprivation; we believe, on the contrary, that they should not.

Our generation more than any other generation of Americans is capable of turning the footsteps of our young people away from the dead-end streets of poverty, hunger, crime and disease. Today we can send them along new pathways of hope, fulfillment and social usefulness.

One means of doing these things is the war on poverty, making available to young people the resources, the benefits, the unprecedented advantages of the anti-poverty programs. That is the story of what is happening today in Philadelphia, a city that believes more and more that its children are its most important possession.

For that reason Philadelphia has devoted most of the Federal money it has received for the war on poverty to programs benefiting its young people. How this has been done is detailed in the following impressive newsstory which ap-

peared in a recent Philadelphia Inquirer article.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that newsstory may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the news-story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. POVERTY GRANTS AIDED CHILDREN MOST, PAAC INFORMS TATE

Children from Philadelphia's slum and ghetto areas have benefited to the greatest extent from the \$28.1 million provided by the Federal Government, an interim report to Mayor James J. H. Tate by the Philadelphia Anti-Poverty Action Committee showed Tuesday.

Children's programs totaled 24, more than half of the 40 financed by the Federal Government, the report indicated. The largest single outlay of the Government grants was \$9.3 million for prekindergarten services to 5500 youngsters.

The second largest expenditure was for \$4.7 million to provide vocational training through the Rev. Leon Sullivan's Opportunities Industrialization Center. Temple University Neighborhood Health Center received the third top allocation of \$3.5 million.

The report showed 760,000 children have received recreational opportunity services that involved operations of 24 agencies.

The PAAC report said that since April, 1965, the organization has found jobs for 7,000 persons from poverty areas. Additional services provided by the organization included legal counsel and assistance, low-income housing and social activities.

At the present time, PAAC, according to the report, has been waiting for review of 11 programs by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

THE WAR ON POVERTY AS AN ANTIDOTE TO RIOTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn now to the suggestion, with which I am in complete accord, that the war on poverty is an antidote to riots.

Two of the most perceptive and probing examinations of the growing importance of the war on poverty to American cities have been written by columnist Roscoe Drummond, whose columns appear in the Philadelphia Inquirer and other newspapers.

Mr. Drummond has taken a long, realistic look at the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its various anti-poverty programs in terms of the bloody and destructive upheavals that struck so many American cities this summer.

After studying the evidence offered by OEO and other sources, Mr. Drummond reaches such significant and solid conclusions as these:

First:

The testimony of the Mayors—

He has reference to the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which I have the honor to be chairman, during the period we were considering the war on poverty amendments for this year:

The testimony of the Mayors shows that without the anti-poverty programs there would have been more violence, little communication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

Second:

The knowledgeable testimony of the Mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Mr. President, because I believe that Mr. Drummond's two studies have important meaning for Members of Congress and for all Americans, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Poverty Programs Are Vital for Cities," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 14, 1967, and the article entitled "Jobs Will Eliminate Rioting in the Cities," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 9, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 14, 1967]

POVERTY PROGRAMS ARE VITAL FOR CITIES
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The people who know the most about race riots and what to do about them are the people who run the cities—the Mayors. Their views deserve the most responsible attention—by Congress and the country.

A nation-wide survey in 64 cities, half of which had riots this summer and half of which didn't shows that the Mayors are overwhelmingly agreed on what does most to cause riots and what can help most to prevent them.

The causes they cite most frequently are two: Lack of jobs and lack of trusted communication between Negroes and local officials.

As to cures, they know better than most that there is no single solution, no instant panacea, but the Mayors—Democratic and Republican—of these 64 cities are unanimous in their conviction that the anti-poverty programs are crucial and constructive forces which need to be continued.

This survey shows conclusively that both the OEO programs and its workers played a major role in keeping scores of cities cool this summer and helped hold rioting down when it wasn't averted.

Because the survey was carried out by the OEO, some might dismiss it as self-serving. But after reading pages of direct quotations by the Mayors themselves, I am convinced its findings are authentic. The message is this:

Whatever else Congress may do to help solve the urban crisis, the one thing not to do is to tear up the anti-poverty administration and programs.

They are needed and nobody knows it better than the American Mayors who have endured the riots and who have seen the programs at work in their communities.

In the Senate the outlook for the anti-poverty bill is good. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee, by a vote of 12 to 3, endorsed a bill to continue and somewhat expand the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for two years.

But there are ominous storm clouds in the House. There are still some Republicans and Southern Democrats who want to dismember the OEO and distribute the programs to other agencies whether the agencies want them or not.

Critics of the war on poverty have seized on headlines about the one or two incidents where poverty workers were charged with helping create a riot-causing climate.

The testimony of the Mayors show that without the anti-poverty programs there would have been more violence, little com-

munication with the slum Negroes, and no significant beginnings of hope and assistance for the urban poor.

As to poverty workers abetting riots, some communities undertake high-risk experiments involving some of the most disaffected and alienated youth. Young men who six months ago were on the streets and in trouble are carefully and cautiously given responsibility, trained to leadership and learn to feel it is just as manly to lead a work program as to lead a gang.

A few proved unreliable. But out of 30,000 community action employees, only 16 were arrested, none convicted. And the poverty program has 244 buildings in the heart of the riot areas; none was burned or destroyed.

In 15 cities local community action agencies calmed down bad situations.

In 13 cities they patrolled trouble spots and served as communication posts between the police and slum areas.

In 14 cities the police and community action agencies had joint programs to prevent riots.

In eight cities the juvenile arrest rate dropped this summer and there is good evidence this was caused by more summer jobs.

The knowledgeable testimony of the Mayors is that the poverty programs help convert militancy into responsibility and offer an alternative to violence.

Their testimony is practical and non-sentimental. It deserves to be heeded.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 9, 1967]

JOBS WILL ELIMINATE RIOTING IN THE CITIES
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Is the major cause of the riots as much in doubt as many suggest? I believe it is not. The doubt arises because in Detroit, for example, most of the militants who generated the rioting were found to have jobs at good wages.

Does this mean that lack of jobs, with the poverty and long unemployment which come in its wake, is not a principal factor in this summer's violence? No.

What it does mean is that the small minority of extremists want riots for their own sake even though most of them are employed.

It means that the best way to disarm the riot-minded extremists is to provide jobs for the unemployed Negroes and whites in the slums who otherwise can be persuaded by the militants that resort to violence is desirable and necessary.

This is what sociologist Daniel P. Moynihan means when he says that the need is to deprive the Negro destructionists of the "Negro underclass which is the source of their present strength."

This is why concerted private enterprise-government determination to do whatever is necessary to provide training and jobs for the ghetto unemployed is the urgent and practicable place to begin.

Nothing conceals the nature of the unemployment problem among the slum poor so much as the remarkable record of the job-creating prosperity which the U.S. has experienced during the past decade. There has been sustained economic growth. Unemployment has dropped below 4 percent.

But despite sustained prosperity and high economic growth there remains a hard core of unemployed which has not been reduced. It perseveres and it is inordinately high among Negroes. While the average unemployment among Negroes is 7 to 8 percent. Among all young people the average unemployment is 12 to 13 percent; the average among Negroes, 25 percent.

This means that the Nation's hard-core unemployment must be tackled as a special problem and that the twice-as-high unemployment among Negroes must be tackled as an extra-special problem brought about mainly by the long denial of equal opportunity in both education and jobs.

The best information is that if 125,000

new jobs can be created in the slum areas in ten cities unemployment there can be cut to the national low of 3.8 percent; 250,000 such jobs could do the same thing in 100 cities; 320,000 such jobs could reduce the total Negro unemployment of 8 percent to the national average of 3.8 percent.

Surely this is a meaningful and attainable objective. It is meaningful because it would make a significant, perhaps a decisive, contribution to social stability in the harassed cities. It can be seen as an attainable objective when you consider that a million and a half jobs are being created yearly, mostly by private business but also through Government programs.

This is a central objective of the Administration today and it seems to me it is headed in the right direction. The Administration is taking two valuable steps. It is constructively enlisting the resources of private industry to provide jobs and, with Government aid, to provide special training so that the hard-core unemployed can fill the jobs. This gears specific training for specific jobs and this is the kind of job-training which can make the maximum appeal and do the most good.

The second thing the Administration is doing is providing a single, central point in the vast, disjointed, overlapping spectrum of the Federal bureaucracy where private business can tap everything the Federal Government is in a position to do to help. How long, oh, how long it has taken!

I am not suggesting that jobs are the sole answer to racial animus and racial injustice. They aren't. But they are the best guarantor of social stability.

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

Mr. CLARK. I turn now, Mr. President, to the impact of the war on poverty on America's forgotten children.

Gradually the Nation has become aroused to the plight of millions of American families living in the squalor of urban slums, and we have become awakened, also, to the horrible living conditions to which we have doomed millions of slum children.

Various Federal war on poverty programs and the work of State, municipal, and private agencies are moving toward alleviation of the worst conditions victimizing the slum children and there is reason to hope that this work will be accelerated.

There is, however, a large group of youngsters—who could be called the forgotten children—for whom very little is being done. Nearly a quarter million children are members of migratory farm workers' families, and in many ways their plight—based largely on the rootlessness of the families—is worse than that of the inner city children.

Recently the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Nation's labor press have spotlighted the appalling conditions under which these migratory children must live and grow.

Press Associates, a national news and feature service for the Nation's labor publications, has done an excellent job of reporting an Agriculture Department study of migrant families and the desperate poverty and deprivation in which they live.

We should not permit these forgotten children to be forgotten any longer. The Nation's migratory farm workers' families should be reached and aided by our antipoverty programs and the children,

especially, should be helped to escape from impoverishment, hunger and inadequate education.

The antipoverty bill passed by the Senate several weeks ago does make a significant contribution to this goal.

I ask unanimous consent that the Press Associates report on these forgotten children be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEARLY A QUARTER MILLION KIDS LEAD MIGRANT'S LIFE

Nearly a quarter million young U.S. children under fourteen years lead the rootless life of the migrant farm worker.

The children are members of farm migratory households who travel with their parents as they follow the picking seasons across the nation.

A government report, issued by the U.S. Agriculture Department, describes the make-up of the migratory farm work force for 1965 and shows that about 140,000 children in this group have fewer educational opportunities "and a lower educational attainment than any other group of American children."

In all, there are about 237,000 children under fourteen in migratory farm work households. Spanish-American and other white families are most likely to take their children with them.

The children are removed from school in the spring when the seasonal farm labor demand is on the rise. They do not return to their home county until two or three months after the regular school term has begun.

They lose time in schools in their home county and attend schools only irregularly on the road. "Local school authorities," says the report, "may be reluctant to enforce school attendance laws for migrant children."

The migrant family's life is one of grinding poverty. About half the migratory workers lived in families where the annual income was below \$3,000 in 1965. The average farm wage rate was \$9.70 per day and the average migrant worker was employed only 82 days at farmwork during 1965.

The combination of a short work year and low wages brings a pitifully low income to the migrant. According to the USDA report, migrants employed exclusively at farm labor earned about \$1,000 a year while those who worked in other jobs earned \$1,700; an average of \$500 from farm work and \$1,200 from nonfarm jobs.

The work season of the average migrant worker was only four months long in 1965 and almost half held nonfarm jobs during the year. Those who could get other work averaged about 7½ months employment; those who only did farm work reported 5 months' work.

Other aspects of the report show that about 466,000 persons were migratory farm workers in 1965, about 15 percent of the entire farm work force. Of these, about 80 percent were white; 70 percent were men and 50 percent were under 25 years old.

The report shows the migrant worker to be poor, uneducated and without the legal protections that those who stay in one area usually enjoy. The farm worker's drive for a minimum wage and collective bargaining rights could change all that.

THE DEPRESSION NEVER ENDED FOR RESIDENTS OF THE SLUMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the depression has never ended for residents of

the slums. This makes the Federal interest in the war on poverty all the more important, and indeed vital. The civil disturbances that exploded in more than a hundred American communities last summer have provoked a great deal of soul searching, and rightly so.

Two questions above all others dominate the reflections of communities and private citizens: First, why did the riots happen; and second, what must we do to prevent their recurrence?

To answer these questions a national examination of the causes and consequences of the riots is now underway by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and scores of other studies have been undertaken by municipalities, private research organizations, labor, and religious groups.

By the time these investigations are completed and correlated, we should know a great deal more than we do now about the economic and social conditions that trigger wholesale destruction and bloodshed and what action must be taken, nationally and locally, to eliminate those conditions.

However, Mr. President, one major cause of the uprisings is already indisputably clear: the depression has never ended for the slum Negro. This is proved by the fact that living conditions in the urban slums have not improved since the depression years—in fact, in many places they have deteriorated horribly since then—and also that the unemployment rate among nonwhite slum residents is two, three, and even four times higher—depending upon age levels—than the national average.

One of the most thoughtful and penetrating analyses of the breeding grounds of riots appears in the current issue of *Nation's Cities*, the authoritative journal published by the highly respected National League of Cities. This editorial deserves a careful and reflecting reading by Members of Congress and all citizens who are concerned with eradicating joblessness, penury, ignorance, and other causes of civil eruptions.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A Way To Attack Rioting's Roots," published in *Nation's Cities* for October 1967 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAY TO ATTACK RIOTING'S ROOTS

"Those terrible days in July—the sudden appearance, as from the bosom of the earth, of a most infuriated and degraded mob; the helplessness of property owners and the better classes; the boom of cannon and rattle of musketry in our streets; the sky lurid with conflagrations; the inconceivable barbarity and ferocity of the crowd . . . the immense destruction of property were the first dreadful revelations to many of our people of the existence among us of a great, ignorant, irresponsible class who were growing up without any permanent interest in the welfare of the community, of the success of the government . . . of the gradual formation of this class and the dangers to be feared from it, the agents of this society have incessantly warned the public for the past 11 years."

This description of whites rioting in New York in 1863 could be of Newark or Detroit

or of a dozen other American cities in which rioting erupted this past summer. Daniel P. Moynihan, who is director of the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, states that the rioting in Detroit and other cities was begun and probably largely continued by young persons who could be described as "urban underclass." They happen in this case to be Negro. And yet, in its first annual report, dated 1854, the Children's Aid Society of New York had predicted the formation of such a class among the white immigrants of the city:

"It should be remembered that there are no dangers to the value of property or to the permanency of our institutions so great as those from the existence of such a class of vagabond, ignorant, and ungoverned children. This dangerous class has not begun to show itself as it will in eight or 10 years when these boys and girls are matured. Those who were too negligent or too selfish to notice them as children will be fully aware of them as men. They will poison society. They will perhaps be embittered at the wealth and the luxuries they never share. Then let society beware, when the outcast, vicious, reckless multitude of New York boys, swarming now in every foul alley and low street come to know their power and use it."

A decade or so ago, Moynihan says, we began to see the formation of a Negro version of this class growing up in our northern cities. We did little or nothing about it.

Moynihan points out that the basic conditions that would appear necessary for the formation of such a class have clearly existed in our cities for a generation now. "First and uppermost," he says, "is unemployment. The Depression has never ended for the slum Negro."

"To unemployment add low wages, add miserable housing, add vicious and pervasive forms of racial discrimination, compound it all with an essentially destructive welfare system, and a social scientist would have every ground on which to predict violence in this violent country."

The "destructive welfare system" he refers to is primarily the miserable Federal Aid to Dependent Children program, which has at some time supported something like six out of every 10 Negro youths reaching 18. This probably accounts for the steady deterioration of family structure in low-income neighborhoods. Probably not more than a third of the children of low-income Negro families now 18 years old have lived all their lives with both parents.

"Breakdown in family relations among poor persons is a pretty good clue that an underclass is forming," according to Moynihan. With something like one New York City child in five living on welfare, Dr. Mitchell Ginsberg of the Lindsay administration this summer declared the system "bankrupt."

The Social Security Act is right now in the process of being overhauled by the U.S. Congress, not by its Labor and Public Welfare Committees, but by its tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee. It retains the old welfare concept of Aid to Dependent Children, which encourages the break-up of families—if the father leaves the household, the mother then becomes eligible for relief for the children. Too many people, including members of Congress, seem to associate the Social Security Act exclusively with insurance taxes for old age pensions and Medicare. Actually the Act has many other titles which have profound influence on our welfare programs, including the out-moded Aid to Dependent Children concept.

The opposite approach should be taken in this country to encourage permanent family formation among the poor, whose children should have the advantage of the experience of family discipline. Moynihan believes the

best known way to do this is through a family (or children's) allowance and points out that the United States is the only industrial democracy in the world that does not have such a system of automatic payments to families who are raising minor children. These payments would have the advantage that everyone would get them, not just a special segment artificially defined as below a certain income level. It has worked well all over the world, including Canada. It needs serious consideration in America.

THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD RESOLVE THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, yesterday I joined with 55 of my colleagues in cosponsoring a Senate resolution requesting that the President consider a new U.S. initiative which would seek to place the question of Vietnam before the United Nations Security Council.

This resolution was suggested by the majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and, having the support of a substantial majority of Senators should be speedily enacted.

Almost 2 years ago Ambassador Goldberg, on instructions from the President, requested the calling of an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Vietnam. This item has remained dormant on the calendar ever since, never having been assigned a specific agenda date.

It is imperative that we once again push for consideration of Vietnam by the Security Council, since much might be gained and nothing is to be lost in a sustained attempt to gain such consideration. At worst, an open defeat of specific moves in this direction by us can hardly be more damaging than rumors and allegations that the United States is preventing negotiations.

I believe that we must make this move if for no other reason than to make it clear that we are willing to lay our position on Vietnam formally on the line. It is high time to clarify by a recorded vote in the U.N. Security Council who is willing and who is not willing to bring the United Nations into the effort to restore peace in Vietnam.

The 56 Senators sponsoring this resolution hold varying views concerning Vietnam. But we share a deep concern and a deep desire for the prompt restoration of peace and a belief that the time is right to resume the U.S. initiative on placing the Vietnam issue before the Security Council.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RESEARCH IN THE SERVICE OF MAN: BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit an original resolution, unanimously approved by the committee, and ask that the same be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of its committee print entitled "Research in the Service of Man: Biomedical Knowledge, Development, and Use."

AMENDMENT NO. 400—SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate increasing support around the country for certain amendments which I have previously filed in the Senate and caused to be printed, which I intend to offer, on behalf of myself and other Senators as cosponsors, to H.R. 12080, the social security bill now pending before the Committee on Finance.

Recently I received a letter dated October 24, 1967, from the Family and Child Services of Washington, D.C., in which it is stated:

Your ideas are so close to our own that I though you would be interested in the enclosed memorandum received today from the Social Work Assistants which this agency has employed under grant from the Bureau of Works Program on contract from our local United Planning Organization.

The letter is signed by John G. Theban, executive secretary of that fine organization. I ask unanimous consent that his letter, together with the attached memorandum which is referred to in the letter—all of which relate to my amendment No. 400, to provide for the establishment of community service aides and social service volunteers in the social welfare program of each of the States—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY AND CHILD SERVICES,
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,

Washington, D.C., October 24, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was delighted to find in a recent edition of the Washington Post excerpts from your speech in the Senate relative to the employment of subprofessionals in public welfare departments. Your ideas are so close to our own that I thought you would be interested in the enclosed memorandum received today from the Social Work Assistants which this agency has employed under grant from the Bureau of Works Program on contract from our local United Planning Organization.

I need not say that this agency has developed conviction that, with the discipline of good training, effective service can be given by people who have been close to the difficulties of those they seek to help. The agency is also closely identified with its trainees and plans to do everything possible to see them incorporated into permanent jobs. This must come not only within the limited scope of voluntary agencies such as Family and Child Services but, more importantly, within the staffs of the public services. In this we need all the support we can get for there must be substantial changes in the staffing patterns of the public serv-

ices before there is an opportunity for the trainees to demonstrate their skills in other settings.

Our Board will be meeting with our Social Work Assistants as they have asked. We will be canvassing not only our own capabilities but will also be planning to enlarge the use of assistants by others. I did wonder, since we are all in Washington, whether you might not find it interesting to meet face to face with our Social Work Assistants, a group of men and women who obviously have much invested in the future of subprofessional service. I know that they would be both encouraged and interested in meeting with you to share their thoughts.

Very truly yours,

JOHN G. THEBAN,
Executive Secretary.

Enclosure.

**FAMILY AND CHILD SERVICES
OF WASHINGTON, D.C.,
Washington, D.C.**

Re Request for meeting with board of trustees to discuss employment of social work assistants.

To: Family and Child Services board of trustees.

From: Family and Child Services social work assistants.

Date: Monday, October 23, 1967.

During the past month, the Social Work Assistants of Family and Child Services have become increasingly concerned with the problem of future employment. It is because of this concern that we hereby request a meeting with the Board at its earliest convenience. We are confident that dialogue of this type will offer concrete answers to the question—"What, after training?"

Throughout the Nation there are hundreds of job training programs which have come into existence through federal legislation as a commitment to fight the War on Poverty. The Neighborhood Services Project of Family and Child Services is one result of this commitment. For many months Social Work Assistants and other trainees have been content with the mere fact that we are being trained. Now that training has developed employable skills in the human service field, we are now faced with the task of finding permanent jobs. Unfortunately, the labor market is not ready or equipped to accept us. We, and many others like us, have been given an opportunity to train and develop social work skills which thereby makes us an available resource to lessen the shortage of professional workers. No one can argue that the need for our skills is desperately needed, yet permanent jobs are virtually non-existent for us in both private and public industry. It seems totally inconceivable that this War on Poverty has not included in its intricate operation of training a preparation for that step beyond—which necessarily means the opening of private and public labor markets. Logically, termination of training must offer permanent jobs, whereby developed skills can be used. The dilemma of our plight is without reason.

We, the Social Work Assistants of Family and Child Services, are committed to the tasks before us. As individuals we cannot effectively alter the establishments which bar our employment, but as a unified body and with the Board of Trustees before us, the establishments can and will be altered. We cannot sit back and complain, we must act now! Intellectual and philosophical discourse is not the answer. We are looking for implementation of this discourse, which means jobs. We see ourselves as moving toward an inevitable "dead-end" if change does not occur. Since others have apparently overlooked this fact, we are prepared to demonstrate the realities of our situation. We are hopeful that you will assist in this demonstration.

By June, 1968 (which is the end of our contract period) twelve Social Work Assistants will have been employed for 2 years 3 months by Family and Child Services in its Neighborhood Services Project. Eight Assistants will have accrued two years of employment by the above date. Nine Assistants will be moving toward a three year celebration of employment in the human service field. Eighteen will be receiving top salaries of \$5150 in accordance with the present merit increases. If refunding through the Labor Department continues, it can be anticipated that a significant number of Assistants will be forced to find other employment in order to make slots available for new trainees. It is also conceivable that refunding may be strongly influenced by the number of Social Work Assistants who have found permanent jobs. Such a demonstration would strongly justify the merits of Neighborhood Services Project training and facilitate its continuation. With this idea in mind, coupled with the closed labor market, we look to Family and Child Services as a beginning point where a representative number of our group can secure permanent employment. Since Family and Child Services has trained our group, it seems logical that our agency should offer jobs and thereby demonstrate to the total community that its commitment to the War on Poverty does not end at training, but goes that forgotten "step beyond." We must have a chance to prove to others, what we know we can do, but we must have a place to begin. If Family and Child Services can be that place, then our completion of training need not be "dead end."

We shall look forward to your prompt reply.

SIMCHAT TORAH

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, 3 million Russian Jews today are celebrating the Simchat Torah. But the celebration is marred because it is taking place in an atmosphere of intense spiritual persecution.

They are 3 million in number—yet their synagogues number only a bare 60.

The Communist leaders of the Soviet Union have prohibited training of Jewish religious teachers and secular teachers.

They have shut down Jewish schools. They have denied nearly 3 million people the religious and cultural facilities which are basic to any government serving its people.

Despite these hardships, the Jews of Russia—indeed, of the world—have faith in their hearts that their cause of religious freedom will prevail.

I join with countless others in the prayerful hope that religious freedom will soon come to all the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative tabulation showing the estimates of the amounts approved in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 12474 (H. REPT. 569, AUG. 18, 1967, PASSED HOUSE, AUG. 22, 1967; S. REPT. 579, OCT. 3, 1967) PASSED SENATE, OCT. 6, 1967—COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED IN THE BILL FOR 1968

Item	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Authorization (Public Law 90-67)	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
							Budget estimate	Authorization (Public Law 90-67)	House allowance	Senate allowance
Research and development.....	\$4,245,000,000	\$4,352,000,000	\$4,147,565,000	\$3,899,500,000	\$3,995,500,000	\$3,925,000,000	-\$427,000,000	-\$222,565,000	+\$25,500,000	-\$70,500,000
Construction of facilities.....	83,000,000	76,700,000	69,980,000	35,900,000	55,400,000	35,900,000	-40,800,000	-34,080,000		-19,500,000
Administrative operations.....	640,000,000	671,300,000	648,206,000	648,000,000	628,000,000	628,000,000	-43,300,000	-20,206,000	-20,000,000	
Total appropriations.....	4,968,000,000	5,100,000,000	4,865,751,000	4,583,400,000	4,678,900,000	4,588,900,000	-511,100,000	-276,851,000	+5,500,000	-90,000,000

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. As I understand the end result of the meeting of the conferees from the House and the Senate, the House receded on the item of \$10 million for tracking and data acquisition, and they also allowed a \$15.5 million item for the Apollo applications program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Am I correct in my understanding that they completely disallowed any amount whatever for the Voyager?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Nevada has been deeply interested in this matter and, I think, rightly so.

The Senate, of course, felt that the nuclear rocket program under research—and development, namely NERVA II and the NERVA I program—should continue because we feel that this is one of the most important phases of the whole space program.

If we can develop a nuclear propulsion system, we would of course make a great breakthrough, not only scientifically but also in many other respects, appropriationwise and every other way, in our quest for knowledge of the space and the world.

With respect to the appropriations for Voyager, the consensus, I believe, of all the conferees, House and Senate, was that no program under research and development should be killed. The conference report language would allow the Administrator of the NASA to come to the respective committees in the Congress, the Space Committees and the Appropriations Committees, after he has an opportunity to review and reprogram these items out of funds provided in this appropriation bill.

The conferees finally agreed to add \$25.5 million in the research and development part of the bill over the House allowance, and suggested that the Administrator then come before the committees within a reasonable time with a new list of priorities for reprogramming.

It is believed that if the Administrator feels that the Voyager should continue—NERVA I and NERVA II—he will present that matter to us, and he will have the authority as outlined in the conference report, to make transfers from within the research and development amount which was a total of \$3,925,000,000, providing the appropriate committees in Congress agree.

The Administrator would then come to us and explain the matter, and if he had a priority on reprogramming, he would be able to furnish the amount of money that he felt necessary for NERVA I, the callback program, and NERVA II, and so forth. We put language in the report which I am sure will interest the Senator from Nevada:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 1: appropriates \$3,925,000,000 for "Research and development" instead of \$3,899,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,995,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has added \$10,000,000 for tracking and data ac-

quisition, and \$15,500,000 over the amount proposed by the House for the Apollo applications program, with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the explanation of the senior Senator from Washington. I want it to be clear that the language that was added in the report of the managers on the part of the House, which the Senator has just read, makes it possible for the administrator to transfer x number of dollars from one line item to another, so long as it is for research and development, even in connection with NERVA. I understand that the conference report also eliminates the construction item for this project.

But in addition to the Apollo applications and the Voyager items, my great concern, as I expressed it on the floor of the Senate at the time the Senate committee returned in disagreement, is this: The NERVA I program now has \$46.5 million. My understanding is that if they are to retain their present capability, their present skills, the present fine group of men working on the research and development in connection with NERVA I and NERVA II, an additional \$7 to \$8 million will be needed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's understanding is correct to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. BIBLE. If I understand the language in the report, it is still possible for the Administrator to reprogram those funds in such a way as to retain this capability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is our understanding. It would have to come to the appropriate committees—the two space committees and the two Appropriations Committees in the House and Senate. I believe his presentation would be to the legislative committees first. He would present a program with the new priorities and within the research and development funds of \$3,925,000,000. He could say, "We think this program should go forward," and make those transfers necessary to provide proper funding.

Mr. BIBLE. It occurs to me that there is sufficient in the overall NASA appropriation to do this if, in the sound judgment of the Administrator and with the concurrence of the appropriate committees—and I am not clear as to whether it would be the Appropriations Committee or the authorizing Space Committee—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both.

Mr. BIBLE. Of both Houses?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BIBLE. Then he could go forward with a transfer of the required number of dollars in order to retain the capability.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He could. In addition, under existing law, he can transfer amounts up to 5 percent from research and development to construction, or vice versa—if he decides to reprogram and reestablish some other priorities.

Mr. BIBLE. I am convinced that the

NERVA I program, to be followed by NERVA II, is very important in the world in which we live, if we are to keep pace with the Soviets. I believe it fair to say that they are ahead of us in this field—at least, that seems to be the indication of recent developments and historical events that have occurred within the past several weeks.

In addition, we must consider emerging Communist China. This has been commented on in our hearings. I believe that here, also, we have a potential threat in the fight to gain supremacy in space. So I believe it is essential that this language be written in.

It was with regret that I learned that the conferees were unable to retain the dollars to fully fund this program, but I also recognize many of the difficulties we face in our appropriation situation at this time.

I commend the Senator from Washington for his very fine efforts.

Mr. President, a vital part of this Nation's program to match the strides of other nations in space research and technology was lost today when House conferees deleted the NERVA development project from the NASA appropriation bill.

I am confident I am not alone when I say this was a regrettable decision and one which may be agonized over in the years ahead; for the action today will have the effect of slowing down even more our efforts in this all-important area.

Since 1957, when Russia launched Sputnik I, the United States has been involved in a deadly serious race to master the mysteries of the universe. We have enjoyed considerable success. Our achievements have been of critical importance, not only because they demonstrated to the world our immense resources in research and technology, but also because we are well aware that the nation which one day controls space will be able to control the destinies of those on earth.

As I said, we have been successful. But the time has come to examine honestly our position in relation to other nations involved in the quest for space. And a candid appraisal will reveal we are in danger of falling far behind.

The competence of the Soviet Union has been all too forcibly reemphasized within the past few days. Indeed, American scientists quoted by United Press International have admitted the "soft" landing on Venus by the Russians leaves us 6 years behind in planetary exploration.

A new threat to our position has emerged in Communist China, which is making rapid advances in research and development of nuclear weapons and space activity. A few short years ago we would have been amused by the idea of nuclear rocket propulsion in the hands of the Chinese. Today it is a fact.

Now we come to the NERVA program. The NERVA II engine has been hailed as a sure means of uprating our giant Saturn V booster, thus making it possible to stay abreast of the Soviets, who reportedly may fly a larger booster in 1968.

There is every reason to believe the Russians are also deeply involved in developing nuclear rocket engines.

How important is NERVA? Let us instantly acknowledge that chemical propulsion of space vehicles is a dead-end proposition. At the present time, nuclear propulsion is the only promising alternative. It would be folly to fail to see the consequences which surely must follow in the next two decades if we do not capitalize on our investment and capability in this area.

While the conferees eliminated \$29.5 million for development of the NERVA II engine, they did authorize the NASA Administrator to reevaluate his research and development programs and make a decision on whether sufficient funds might be transferred from other activities to retain the capability of NERVA.

I strongly urge him to take this course of action. Surely, there is sufficient money in the \$4.5 billion-plus NASA appropriation to sustain NERVA until such time as Congress feels revenues are available to fully fund the program.

I sincerely believe there is an excellent possibility that Congress, in the near future, will determine that NERVA is vitally needed. But in the meanwhile, we cannot afford to lose the expertise of brilliant technicians who over the years have developed the capability of this important program.

The commitment to date for NERVA has exceeded \$1 billion. We would add to this expense substantially if we first lost the services of the first scientific people involved and then had to regroup and retrain them in the near future, along with the sophisticated equipment they operate.

If, because of tight fiscal pressures, the NERVA program cannot be funded this year, let us not totally abandon a concept that has proved its merit in the all-important race for the stars. Let us agree that NERVA has proved its worth. It was needed before. It is needed now. It will be needed in the years ahead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Nevada.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is a member of the conference committee.

I say to the Senator from Nevada that we did our best under the circumstances.

I believe that research in connection with nuclear rockets is one of the most important undertakings of the entire program. I hope that the reprogramming will be such that we will not lose what has been accomplished, and that we can proceed in a reasonable way to try to achieve this great breakthrough in the space program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to assure the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and others who have special interests in various parts of this program that the Senator from Washington, as chairman of the conference committee, was extremely loyal not only to the Senate bill but also to every feature of the matter, including NERVA II, the Voyager, the

Apollo applications, and all other controversial features.

In his effort to prevail in accordance with the wishes of the Senate as expressed here, the chairman of the conference committee had the complete support, without any deviation, of every other member of the conference. I believe the best was done that could be done. It appeared that the House conferees had more interest, as did some of the Senate conferees, in the Apollo applications, and it was easier to get a small increase in that respect. In fact, that seemed to be the only instance in which we could get an increase, along with the expression to which the Senator has referred, to the effect that what it amounts to is that none of us, as laymen, can possibly know what are the true priorities in these very complex matters; that we are perfectly willing to hear the Administrator make recommendations for reprogramming; and that the reprogramming can apply to NERVA II, the Voyager, or to other phases of the entire budgeted program.

That recommendation, if it comes from the Administrator, must be one that he can sell to the authorizing committees, the legislative committees of the two bodies, as well as to the Appropriations Committee. I do not believe there will be any unwillingness on the part of any member of the authorizing committees, of which I happen to be one, and of the Appropriations Committee, of which I also am a member, to study with complete fairness any recommendations that come from the Administrator, and to admit that he is bound to know, with the assistance of his scientists, much more about the necessary priorities than any of us can know. We have done the best we can.

I believe no reference has been made today—there was no necessity for making it, in fact—that the House yielded to us on the reduction of the administrative budget which was agreed to in the earlier conference on this bill, in the amount of \$20 million. So that the entire conference, taking the two together—the most recent one and the earlier one—shows a mutuality, a giving, in both directions, which is always necessary in a very complicated and expensive program of this nature.

I assure the Senator from Nevada that not the slightest prejudice was evident, that the Senator from Florida was able to see, against the course of action which has been so ably described by the chairman of the committee. I am sure that it will permit—if the scientific facts justify it—going on with any phase of the entire program, including NERVA II, the Voyager, the Apollo applications, and the other phases of the program that can be shown to be of immediate and of prior importance in connection with the further advancement of this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might point out to both distinguished Senators from Nevada how solid the Senate was with respect to this matter. This appropriate conference report language was actually suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] who felt so strongly

about this program that he worked out this language, and it was with some difficulty that we were able to include the language in the report.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the view expressed. I know that this was a fine group of conferees. They fought extremely well and they did a remarkable job under the climate in which they worked.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished committee for the fine work they did.

I am deeply disappointed in the decision of the conferees which essentially receded to the position held by the House on funding for the nuclear rocket engine program.

I share the concern to economize in all Federal activities during the current fiscal crisis and I also know that most of the conferees on the Senate side shared my appreciation for the deserved priority position which NERVA had won for itself.

While I cannot support the conferees in their final decision, I note with some optimism that the final decision on NERVA is to be left to the discretion of Mr. Webb, the Director of NASA. I feel confident that Mr. Webb will wisely minimize political consideration and make his decision solely on the basis of what is necessary and advantageous for the future of the space program. I feel sure that he will recognize that the Nation already has invested \$1 billion in the development of the nuclear rocket engine during a period of many years and with outstanding success.

As a consistent supporter of NERVA and as a member of the Senate Space Committee since 1959 I would like to point out that the committee has—from the inception of this program—supported it without reservation and unanimously. Mr. Webb and his experts now will have to weigh the relative priorities and distinguish between what President Johnson called the things we would like to do and the things that are necessary. I am confident that in such a decision the nuclear rocket engine on its own merits would command the highest priority. The NERVA program offers the only practical means within the next decade of closing the propulsion gap which has given the U.S.S.R. predominance in space propulsion and which will continue to confound our efforts to close that gap and forge ahead.

I was pleased to note that the conferees included a statement in their report which outlines their clear understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress. As a member of the Senate Space Committee I look forward to the appearance of Mr. Webb and his response to this request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, even though the two Senators from Nevada do have an interest in the matter because so much of the work is done in that area, I think that the entire Senate will agree with me, that research for

nuclear rockets is one of the most important things we can do in the space program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as one who has followed the entire space program this year in the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Appropriations, even though I was not one of the conferees, I highly commend all of those who worked so diligently and so hard on the subject. I know, too, that over the years there has not been a stronger group of friends for the space program than those who are in the Senate.

I extend my thanks especially to the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] who has worked on both the authorization and the appropriation. There are many others.

This year I had the opportunity to come in closer contact with the work of the chairman of this subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], not only in this bill but in connection with other bills. I already knew that he was a valuable Member of this Chamber, but I found him to be an increasingly valuable Member. He is valuable to his State, but he is also valuable to the entire Senate, and he is highly valuable to the Nation. He has the finest kind of knowledge. I am familiar with much of his work, and I have no reservation in saying that he is one of the most valuable Senators we have and he deals with many highly important and difficult matters very effectively.

I appreciate the efforts of all conferees, including the chairman, in working to get this language.

It seems to me that it would be a tragedy if we should stop at the end of the Apollo program and come to a dead stop. It must not happen. There is this \$15.5 million which is applicable to the post-Apollo program. There is the authority with proper congressional supervision with respect to Voyager and NERVA II, and some of that money could go into Apollo. I think this program must continue.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. All of us

on the Committee on Appropriations try to do the best job we know how. We work hard on all of these items and try to be as economical as we can, consistent with the needs of a great nation.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished and able chairman of the committee at this time.

In the necessary absence of the ranking minority member of the Space Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. ALLOTT] and at his request, I wish to make the following statement:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT READ BY
SENATOR SMITH

Mr. President, the House and Senate conferees could not agree during their first conference on the NASA appropriations bill on figures for research and development and construction of facilities. The Senate conferees insisted that funds should be included for the Voyager program and for both research and development and construction of a testing station for the NERVA II program.

At the second conference, agreement was reached to add \$15,500,000 to research and development over the House figure with the following statement to be included in the conference report: "with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress."

Mr. President, I believe, and I know some of the conferees share this belief, that this country must move ahead now in research and development leading to interplanetary exploration. It is for this reason that the conferees agreed to include this language which would leave it to the NASA Administrator and the President to determine the proper order of priorities that will best serve the national interest among the various space programs and projects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine.

I share the view of the Senator from Mississippi that on this program it is somewhat difficult for lay people to understand the complexities of these matters. I know of no one on the Commit-

tee on Appropriations who contributes more, so that we will hopefully make the correct decisions, than the Senator from Maine. She is to be complimented. It is pleasant to have a fine lady in the conference with us. The Senator from Maine does a marvelous job.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the Senator for his comments. It is because of his leadership that we have been able to bring about this agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 58, 59, and 67 to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative table showing estimates of the amount approved by the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT								
National Aeronautics and Space Council								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$525,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	-----	-----	-----
Office of Emergency Planning								
Salaries and expenses.....	4,700,000	4,780,000	4,700,000	4,740,000	4,700,000	—\$80,000	-----	—\$40,000
Salaries and expenses, telecommunications.....	1,600,000	2,245,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	1,945,000	—300,000	-----	-----
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....	4,000,000	2 (3,688,000)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000	-----	-----
Total, Office of Emergency Planning.....	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	2,620,000	-----	—40,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I								
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Con.								
Office of Science and Technology								
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,200,000	\$1,837,000	\$1,450,000	\$1,650,000	\$1,550,000	—\$287,000	+\$100,000	—\$100,000
Total, Executive Office of the President.....	12,025,000	9,386,000	11,619,000	11,859,000	11,719,000	+2,333,000	+100,000	—140,000
President's Commission on Postal Organization								
Salaries and expenses.....		\$1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	—500,000	+1,000,000	—500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT								
Disaster relief.....	24,550,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Alaska mortgage indemnity grants.....	2,600,000							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES								
Civil Aeronautics Board								
Salaries and expenses.....	12,200,000	9,066,000	8,900,000	9,066,000	8,983,000	—83,000	+83,000	—83,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization).....	63,500,000	54,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	—1,500,000		
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	—1,583,000	+83,000	—83,000
Civil Service Commission								
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....	22,900,000	\$38,033,000	23,000,000	38,033,000	36,000,000	—2,033,000	+13,000,000	—2,033,000
By transfer.....	(6,431,000)	(6,129,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(6,100,000)	(—29,000)		
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations.....	600,000							
Annuities under special acts.....	1,430,000	1,336,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	—36,000		
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits.....	36,644,000		40,748,000	40,748,000	40,748,000	+40,748,000		
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....	73,000,000		71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	+71,000,000		
Payments to trust funds.....		111,748,000				—111,748,000		
Total, Civil Service Commission.....	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	—2,069,000	+13,000,000	—2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel								
Salaries and expenses.....	175,000			25,000	25,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	17,852,300	\$19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	—121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,220,000	\$14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000	—610,000		—225,000
Federal Trade Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	—75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration								
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	244,091,000	262,152,000	260,000,000	261,000,000	260,500,000	—1,652,000	+500,000	—500,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings.....	80,000,000	89,800,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	—9,800,000		
Construction, public buildings projects.....	125,318,000	62,545,700	54,511,900	70,641,900	63,757,900	+1,212,200	+9,246,000	—6,884,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	14,132,000	15,276,000	20,285,000	21,074,000	20,285,000	+5,009,000		—789,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	6,746,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000			
Expenses, U.S. court facilities.....	1,500,000	1,640,000	1,175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	—640,000	—175,000	
Additional court facilities.....	6,000,000							
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	65,000,000	70,508,000	67,500,000	69,500,000	68,500,000	—2,008,000	+1,000,000	—1,000,000
Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination.....	500,000							
Automatic data processing fund.....		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000			
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	17,121,000	17,610,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	17,580,000	—30,000		
National historical publications grants.....	350,000	500,000	350,000	500,000	350,000	—150,000		—150,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service.....	5,900,000	6,000,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	5,880,000	—120,000		
Operating expenses, property management and disposal service (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....		(27,440,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(27,300,000)	(—140,000)		
Operating expenses Utilization and Disposal Service (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(9,000,000)							
Strategic and critical materials (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(20,091,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	1,747,000	1,823,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	1,747,000	—76,000		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000	235,000			
Administrative operations fund (limitation).....	(16,716,000)	(16,699,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(16,650,000)	(—49,000)		
Working capital fund.....	100,000	100,000				—100,000		—100,000
General supply fund.....	45,000,000							
Total, General Services Administration.....	613,740,000	540,539,700	521,613,900	541,607,900	532,184,900	—8,354,800	+10,571,000	—9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	—324,000	+60,000	—70,000
Payment of loan guarantees.....	17,400,000							

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—Continued								
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued								
National Capital Housing Authority								
Operation and maintenance of properties.....	\$37,000							
National Science Foundation								
Salaries and expenses.....	479,999,000	\$526,000,000	\$495,000,000	\$505,000,000	\$495,000,000	—\$31,000,000		—\$10,000,000
Renegotiation Board								
Salaries and expenses.....	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000			
Securities and Exchange Commission								
Salaries and expenses.....	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	—95,000		—95,000
Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration								
Salaries and expenses.....	800,000							
Selective Service System								
Salaries and expenses.....	58,940,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000			
Veterans' Administration								
General operating expenses.....	182,437,000	184,342,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	183,221,000	—1,121,000		
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	14,312,000	14,300,000	13,650,000	14,300,000	13,975,000	—325,000	+\$325,000	—325,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	44,258,000	46,458,000	45,250,000	46,458,000	45,850,000	—608,000	+600,000	—608,000
Medical care.....	1,292,875,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000	1,357,293,000			
Compensation and pensions.....	4,474,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,558,000,000	4,458,000,000	4,558,000,000			
Readjustment benefits.....	369,400,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000	427,200,000			
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	3,500,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000	5,150,000			
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	1,136,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000			
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	52,125,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,600,000	52,600,000	+600,000	+600,000	
Grants for construction of State nursing homes.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Participation sales authorization.....	(260,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(850,000,000)		(+550,000)	
Payment of sales insufficiencies.....		946,000	333,882	946,000	665,000	—281,000	+331,118	—281,000
Loan guarantee revolving fund (limitation on obligations).....	(401,750,000)	Language	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(386,046,000)	(+386,046,000)		
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	—1,735,000	+1,856,118	—1,214,000
Total, Independent Offices.....	7,914,424,300	8,082,296,700	8,010,509,782	8,059,497,900	8,036,354,900	—45,941,800	+25,845,118	—23,143,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE								
Civil Defense								
Operation and maintenance.....	66,100,000	73,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	66,100,000	—7,000,000		
Research, shelter survey and marking.....	35,000,000	37,900,000	20,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	—17,900,000		—5,000,000
Total, Civil Defense, Department of Defense.....	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	—24,900,000		—5,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
Public Health Service								
Emergency health activities.....	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	—3,500,000		—426,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT								
Renewal and Housing Assistance								
Alaska housing.....		1,000,000		1,000,000		—1,000,000		—1,000,000
Grants for neighborhood facilities.....	17,000,000	42,000,000	27,000,000	42,000,000	30,000,000	—12,000,000	+3,000,000	—12,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....		32,773,000	31,950,000	32,773,000	31,950,000	—823,000		—823,000
Urban renewal programs:								
Grants, fiscal year 1968.....	750,000,000		750,000,000	750,000,000	750,000,000			
Grants, fiscal year 1969.....		750,000,000						
Administrative expenses.....	15,395,000							
Rehabilitation loan fund.....	1,396,000							
Low-rent public housing annual contributions.....	255,000,000	290,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	275,000,000	—15,000,000		
Administrative expenses, public housing programs.....	18,950,000							
Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund.....	80,000,000	80,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	25,000,000	—55,000,000	+5,000,000	—15,000,000
Total, renewal and housing assistance.....	1,137,741,000	1,195,773,000	1,103,950,000	1,140,773,000	1,111,950,000	—83,823,000	+8,000,000	—28,823,000
Metropolitan Development								
Urban planning grants.....	33,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	—5,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Metropolitan development incentive grants.....		30,000,000				—30,000,000		
Open space land programs.....	55,000,000	125,000,000	75,000,000	100,000,000	75,000,000	—50,000,000		—25,000,000
Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.....	100,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000			
Salaries and expenses.....		6,430,000	6,100,000	6,250,000	6,100,000	—330,000		—150,000
Urban transportation activities:								
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1968.....	125,000,000							
Urban mass transportation grants, fiscal year 1969.....		230,000,000	175,000,000	205,000,000	175,000,000	—55,000,000		—30,000,000
Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities.....	735,000							
Total, metropolitan development.....	313,735,000	606,430,000	461,100,000	526,250,000	466,100,000	—140,330,000	+5,000,000	—60,150,000

See footnotes at end of speech.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968, H.R. 9960—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR 1968—Continued

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Item	Appropriations, 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—Continued								
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued								
Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations								
Model cities programs.....	\$11,000,000	\$662,000,000	\$237,000,000	\$537,000,000	\$312,000,000	—\$350,000,000	+\$75,000,000	—\$225,000,000
Urban information and technical assistance.....		6,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,200,000	—3,800,000	+200,000	—800,000
Community development training programs.....		5,000,000	2,500,000	4,500,000	3,000,000	—2,000,000	+500,000	—1,500,000
Fellowship for city planning and urban studies.....	\$ (500,000)	500,000		500,000	500,000		+500,000	
Urban studies and housing research.....	500,000							
Urban research and technology.....		20,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	—10,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Low-income housing demonstration programs.....	1,575,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	—500,000		
Housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards.....	1,500,000							
Salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation.....		3,350,000	1,850,000	2,200,000	1,850,000	—1,500,000		—350,000
By transfer.....		(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)		(+500,000)	
Total, demonstrations and intergovernmental relations.....	14,575,000	699,350,000	250,350,000	564,200,000	331,550,000	—367,800,000	+81,200,000	—232,650,000
Mortgage Credit								
Rent supplement program:								
Annual contract authorization.....	(20,000,000)	(40,000,000)		(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(—30,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(—30,000,000)
Appropriation for payments.....	2,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Administrative expenses.....	900,000	1,150,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,100,000	—50,000	+100,000	—50,000
Total, mortgage credit.....	2,900,000	6,150,000	6,000,000	6,150,000	6,100,000	—50,000	+100,000	—50,000
Departmental Management								
General administration.....		4,510,000	3,950,000	4,230,000	4,000,000	—510,000	+50,000	—230,000
Regional management and services.....		5,563,000	5,300,000	5,430,000	5,300,000	—263,000		—130,000
Office building equipment and furnishings:								
Appropriation.....	575,000							
By transfer.....	(125,000)							
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary.....	8,574,000							
Participation sales authorizations.....	(1,420,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(581,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)	(2,385,000,000)		(+1,804,000,000)	
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies.....	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 42,115,000	23,000,000	42,115,000	23,000,000	—19,115,000		—19,115,000
Working capital fund.....		1,500,000	\$ (1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	—1,500,000		
Total, departmental management.....	17,349,000	53,688,000	32,250,000	51,775,000	32,300,000	—21,388,000	+50,000	—19,475,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban De- velopment.....	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,948,000,000	—613,391,000	+94,350,000	—341,148,000
Total appropriations.....	9,550,999,300	10,793,073,700	9,985,878,782	10,487,530,900	10,112,173,900	—680,899,800	+126,295,118	—375,357,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts (proceeds of sales).....	29,091,000	27,440,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	27,300,000	—140,000		
Grand total.....	9,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,139,473,900	—681,039,800	+126,295,118	—375,357,000

¹ Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.² Included in budgets of individual departments and agencies.³ Contained in S. Doc. 40.⁴ Budget amendment in S. Doc. 36 increases by \$14,614,000 for interagency boards, and decreases by \$664,000 for investigations.⁵ Includes budget amendment in H. Doc. 114.⁶ Estimated amount of indefinite appropriation.⁷ Additional contract authority, beginning July 1, 1967, on urban renewal projects within comprehensive city programs, authorized by sec. 113.⁸ By transfer.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitation on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

[House Report No. 259, May 12, 1967; Passed House, May 17, 1967; Senate Report No. 548, August 29, 1967; Passed Senate, September 21, 1967]

Corporation or agency	Appropriations, 1967 ¹	Budget estimates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE II								
CORPORATIONS								
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:								
Administrative expenses.....	(\$4,410,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)	(\$4,540,000)			
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(13,465,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)	(13,650,000)			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)			
Department of Housing and Urban Development:								
College housing loans.....	(2,089,000)	(2,270,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(2,200,000)	(—\$70,000)		
Housing for the elderly or handicapped.....	(1,232,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(1,232,000)	(—10,000)		
Public facility loans.....	(1,205,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)	(1,187,000)			
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	(110,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)			
Federal Housing Administration:								
Administrative expenses.....	(10,650,000)	(11,125,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(—125,000)		
Nonadministrative expenses.....	(85,000,000)	(88,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(87,000,000)	(—1,500,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(9,931,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)			
Total, administrative expenses.....	(128,377,000)	(132,512,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(130,807,000)	(—1,705,000)		

¹ Includes amounts contained in the 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1967.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I wish to query the distinguished chairman

of the committee about one item in the bill. How much money is involved in the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total bill on independent offices is \$10,139,473,900.

Mr. BARTLETT. My interest, of course, does not center exclusively about the one subject which I desire to talk about now. However, I must admit I was disappointed and deeply hurt upon learning that the conferees had failed to accept the Senate figure of \$1 million which would have been used for the launching of an Alaska native housing program.

Last year, Congress passed and the President signed a bill to provide for such a program amounting to \$10 million. The Budget Bureau this year asked that the program be initiated with an appropriation of \$1 million. The House Appropriations Committee, and the House subsequently, denied that request. As I recall, the reason assigned by the House Appropriations Committee was that the State of Alaska had not yet presented its program.

When hearings were held before the Senate Appropriations Committee, such a presentation was made. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] were instrumental in calling upon the State officials to pay for all of the administrative costs under the program. The State subsequently agreed to do that, and I think it was a move in the right direction.

Mr. President, I was not a conferee on the bill, but I heard from Senators who were on the conference committee that the Senator from Washington fought hard and fought valiantly for this \$1 million item which was for people. I know it was through no fault of his that the figure of \$1 million was not accepted.

No other program, save for the limited exception of the Farmers Home Administration program, fits the circumstances which surround housing for Alaskan Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts in the remote villages of my State.

In the fall of 1965, Mrs. Mary McGuire, then the Public Housing Administrator, toured a good many of the Indian villages. She said that she had never visited a slum in the United States where living conditions were so squalid, so deplorable, and so much of a shame to our country as in Alaska.

I want to thank my friend from Washington now, and likewise the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], for having done their very best to have this program adopted. I trust that the administration will again ask for an appropriation next January and that Congress will approve it, because if ever there was a need for something to be done for people, this is it.

I reiterate, praise has been heaped upon the Senator from Washington here today—and justly so—for accomplishments which relate to things. Here, he sought to do something for people. The natives of Alaska who are so deeply disturbed by the failure of the program, will not forget the efforts he has made in their behalf.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I

thank the Senator from Alaska. I do not know of any one item in the bill that the Senate could not prevail on, which disappointed me—as well as the Senator from Colorado—so much as this comparatively small item to begin some decent and well-thought-out housing for the natives of Alaska. Actually, it was a health program, when we come right down to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator brought that out, because all the conferees stood back of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado, both of whom made it clear that the prevalence of tuberculosis in such a great degree among those impoverished and not properly housed aborigines—for that is what they are—was something that should be corrected. If stronger arguments could have been made, I do not see how they could have been made, or if a more unified position had been taken on the part of the Senate conferees, I do not see how that could have been done.

However, the situation existing right now in connection with the economy is almost indescribable. There are many who regarded the program as not economical. This, to me, appears to be false economy. This program is certainly not uneconomical. I think it was the unanimous attitude of the conferees, unless we wanted to have no bill, that it was one of the several items which had to be eliminated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The point was made that this is a new program and might lead to the expenditure of a large sum of money, even though the bill, which had been passed practically unanimously, put a ceiling on the authorization for a period of time. Of course, it is pennywise and pound foolish, because if those people are to continue to have a health problem—as they certainly will under the present kind of housing they must endure—the Indian Service, the NIH, or others will have to take care of it anyway.

This program is the way to provide them with some decent habitation. It would not even really be decent housing, the way we think of it, but it certainly would be better housing than now exists, so that these people would not be so susceptible to tuberculosis, which is now spreading among them like wildfire. We acted on that basis.

I think, however, that there was a question of timing. The House did not have the proper testimony early enough. There was a failure on the part of the State government to clearly outline their participation. Although I do not criticize its motives. The timing was bad, when the State government wanted Congress to take care of the whole program and not take care of the administrative costs themselves under the Alaskan Housing Authority.

Finally, after a lot of prodding from Congress and others, they did. This proposal was brought in. By that time, the House had planted its feet in concrete and would not do anything about it.

I am not criticizing the motives of anybody, but there was a question of timing. This program is the best way, the cheapest way, the low-cost way of solving a problem that will have to be taken care of some day soon.

I can remember the Senator from Alaska discussing the problem with me at one time. Employment in that region is sporadic, depending on the fish run. If the fish run is good, the people are able to supplement their earnings and make a living. Otherwise they are unemployed.

It was necessary for Congress to appropriate a large sum of money at the time of the earthquake disaster in Alaska. We continually take such action. This is the way to do it.

I think the action that was taken by the conference as to this program was shortsighted, because it is a program to enable people to help themselves. When they built their houses according to the health specifications, they are to receive credit for the amount of time and work they devote to the actual construction. They do not have the materials; it is necessary that they be sent to them.

This is a well-thought-out program. The action taken by the conferees, however, is something I cannot understand. In agreeing with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I think that some of the actions taken in the last few days have been pennywise and pound foolish, in the name of economy. All of us are for economy, but there are some things that the Nation can afford for the needs of the people, and the Alaskan natives are citizens of the United States. They have a rough, rugged time of living. I am disappointed in the action that has been taken.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Washington has given a most adequate description of the situation. I thank him for his observations. He has described the situation better than I have ever heard it expressed by anyone previously. The Senator is ever so correct in stating that the Alaskan natives housing program would have as one of its chief purposes the betterment of public health.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. If this amount had been in the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have no doubt that it would have been approved. Yet here we were trying to start a program in a much less costly way to achieve a health goal that is absolutely necessary by providing adequate housing.

Mr. BARTLETT. My recollection is that the rate of infant mortality in the lower Yukon River Valley is something like 25 times that of the remainder of the country. It is not intended that man-sions should be built there. A maximum limit was set.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The housing proposed to be built in Alaska would have been considered anywhere else as a very bare minimum.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course; but it represented an improvement only by way of what the natives have now. It would be a grant and loan program. The maxi-

imum amount that could be spent on any one house would be \$7,500.

I wish to thank all the Senate conferees for the strong effort they made in behalf of this program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one did more to push the program than did the Senator from Alaska, and rightly so. But the action taken by the conference was very disappointing, when we consider the area, the people, and what the Government is doing all over the rest of the United States for its other citizens. I do not think the program is wrong. I am not making comparisons, but to have the conference single out this fine program and say, "We are not going to do anything about it," is most disappointing.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like to say, first, that I know, personally, how hard the Senator from Washington fought for the two programs. Incidentally, are we discussing the model cities program now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize how hard the Senator from Washington fought for the two programs as they passed the Senate. I saw him in committee. Although I did not sit in conference, I have had a blow-by-blow description of everything he did.

I would like to make it clear, first, that whatever has resulted in conference is due to him. So whatever I say is in no way attached to the diligence, the good faith, and the effort of the Senator from Washington. He certainly did everything he could.

What I would like to make clear is this. Here we are again with what is definitely a wrong sense of priorities when we have a deep and pressing problem which is before us as the No. 1 problem; namely, the problem of the cities.

The tremendous population shift which has taken place to the cities and is going on now has not yet been remotely recognized in legislation which has matured here in the Congress. Here in the model cities program was the really first comprehensive, business-sense idea of how to mobilize the full resources of government upon a given target, with the greatest possible coordinated result, and we have the worst fight made that has been made on almost any program, and the fight originates in the other body, which is referred to as the people's Representatives, because they are supposedly closer to the people, and the amount is cut from \$262 million to \$237 million.

With respect to the rent supplements, again the same thing. Only 25 percent of what was requested within the budget is granted in the final conference compromise.

I could not let these items go by without calling the sharpest attention to the completely wrong end of the telescope view which is represented by cutting these two programs, which promised much for the cities, but which yet were cut to ribbons, ever after the most Herculean efforts by the Senator from Wash-

ington, before they could become law and have appropriations provided for them.

Also, I think a bad mistake was made, and I protest it, in striking out the provision relating to metropolitan expeditors. I think the systems management idea on both sides, that of the receiver and the giver, is critically important to the success of a coordinated program in the big cities, in which every Member must know I have a great deal of experience.

So, more in sorrow than in anger, I say we are not as yet showing the understanding of the priorities which the national interest requires. It is most deplorable and regrettable that such tremendous cutting, and in my judgment in a discriminatory way, should have taken place with respect to these programs which are so peculiarly adjusted to the problems of our cities, namely the model cities and the rent supplements programs.

I am grateful to my Senate colleagues on the conference committee for preserving what they have. I know nothing would be here for those programs if they had not done what they did, led by the Senator from Washington. I can only pledge to my constituents, and to the millions of others who live in the cities, which face such intolerable situations, the indefatigable and continuing effort to get within the schedule of the Nation's priorities such programs to meet those problems, of which these deserve the highest priorities and are really deserved by the American people in view of the situations which they face in the slums and ghettos in America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry to say my distinguished friend, and the distinguished friend of the Senator from New York, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], was called away on an emergency matter and asked me to complete this matter.

When the Senator from New York referred to the indefatigable way in which the Senator from Washington handled this matter for the model cities and for the rent supplements, both in conference and prior thereto, he was exactly correct. I want the RECORD to show and Senators to know that all Senate conferees supported him in those matters, in spite of the fact that those two items are controversial and that in the conference there were Members of the Senate who have different ideas as to the merit of those programs. But that did not make any difference. The Senate had spoken, and the conference committee stood loyally and completely behind the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Washington. I do not know how he could have made any greater efforts. As a matter of fact, I must say to my distinguished friend that he got more than had been expected to be given by the conferees on the other side when we began the conference.

I know that my friend will not desist in his efforts. My suggestion is that anyone who may be interested in either of these programs, including, of course, himself, should make sure that this program for this year be as successful and demonstrate as much quality for doing

the things which it is hoped to be done by these programs as possible. I think unless there is a clear demonstration of their value, we are apt to run into this same trouble again. This is not the first time we have run into it, as the Senator knows; we ran into it in connection with the supplemental bills of last year. I would only state that the conference committee stood by him and the verdict of the Senate.

Second, I would hope the character of these two programs will be well demonstrated and well shown by the use of the funds supplied by this bill in the year that lies ahead of us.

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly assure the Senator that anything I can do in that regard will be done; but I repeat that the deep feeling of the people of the cities on the subject is that this reflects a completely inverted view of national priorities, and that a great deal more should have been done about it in this Congress, considering the inflammatory and dangerous situation we face in the slums and ghettos of our great cities.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I see present the Senator from Rhode Island, who made such a gallant fight for both of these programs, not only in the conference but heretofore, and I shall be happy to yield to him if he has anything he wishes to add.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield to me first? I humbly apologize to Senator PASTORE; he is very senior and very influential, and a great friend of these programs, and I would certainly wish to join him in everything I said about the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I have nothing to add, except simply to reiterate everything that has been said, and to state, with bloody but unbowed head, that we did the best we could under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The re-

port will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 19, 1967, pp. 29382-29385, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE, Mr. President, a great deal has been spoken and written regarding this legislation. Therefore, it is not my intention to burden this record with an extensive statement. I merely will repeat what I said before.

Radio and television broadcasting are forces of staggering importance in our society. Approximately one and a half billion man-hours per week are spent with these media by the people of this country. Television viewing alone occupies nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American. The airwaves themselves over which programs are broadcast are public property. Developing this natural resource in the best interests of society as a whole has been the subject of previous congressional action. In 1962 concern for this development prompted the Commerce Committee to urge passage of Public Law 87-447, an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, to hasten the construction of ETV stations. The intent of S. 1160, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is to improve the facilities and program quality of the Nation's educational broadcasting stations so that this natural resource may be used to its fullest for the betterment of individual and community life.

The conferees, in resolving the differences, have attempted to create broad guidelines that would permit experimentation and innovation in all forms of programming.

I commend my colleagues and the Members of the House who participated in the conference for the fair and efficient manner in which the differences were resolved.

I submit for the RECORD at this time the statement on the part of the conferees which was prepared jointly by the House and the Senate and sets forth in detail the areas of agreement, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement of the conferees was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1160) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study

of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the conference substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

EDITORIALIZING

The House amendment contains provisions which would prohibit any noncommercial educational broadcast station from engaging in editorializing or supplying or opposing any candidate for political office. The Senate bill contains no comparable provisions.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the House provision when it was explained that the prohibition against editorializing was limited to providing that no noncommercial educational broadcast station may broadcast editorials representing the opinion of the management of such station. It should be emphasized that these provisions are not intended to preclude balanced, fair, and objective presentations of controversial issues by noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

These provisions are consistent with the requirements of section 396(g)(1)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (which would be added by the conference substitute) which require that programs or series of programs of a controversial nature which are made available by the Public Broadcasting Corporation must adhere strictly to objectivity and balance.

DEFINITION OF "EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION OR RADIO PROGRAMS"

The House amendment defines "educational television or radio programs" to mean "programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes". The Senate bill contained no comparable provisions. The conference substitute includes a definition of the term which is the same as the House version but for the deletion of the words "and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes".

OBJECTIVITY AND BALANCE OF CORPORATION PROGRAMS

Under both the Senate bill and the House amendment the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television and radio broadcast stations". The House amendment provides, in addition, that in the case of programs of a controversial nature there must be strict adherence to objectivity and balance. The conference substitute adopts these provisions of the House amendment with a modification so as to make the requirement more flexible. As so modified, each program in a series need not meet the test of objectivity and balance, but the series, when considered as a whole, must.

ARRANGEMENT BY CORPORATION FOR INTERCONNECTIONS

Under the Senate bill and the House amendment, the Public Broadcasting Corporation is authorized to "arrange, by grant or contract . . . for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast sta-

tions". Under the House amendment, however, the Corporation could only make such arrangements with those appropriate private agencies, organizations, or institutions which were *nonprofit*. This would have required the Corporation to make arrangements for interconnection facilities through nonprofit intermediaries and would, consequently, have delayed and complicated the Corporation's operations. This requirement has been omitted in the conference substitute.

The managers on the part of the House feel that the Corporation needs this flexibility, not to establish a fixed-schedule network operation, but in order to take advantage of special or unusual opportunities that warrant the Corporation directly contracting for interconnection facilities. Even under these circumstances, however, it should be made clear that the decision to broadcast any program for which interconnection is provided by the Corporation remains entirely within the discretion of the local station. In addition, it should be pointed out that this change does not mean that others—such as a group of noncommercial educational broadcast stations or a noncommercial educational radio or television network—could not also arrange for interconnection and receive financial assistance for it in the form of a grant or contract from the Corporation. The conference substitute would permit this to be done.

Further, the conferees wish to make it clear that the limitation contained in proposed section 396(k)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 should not and is not intended to apply with respect to interconnection costs.

SYSTEMS OF INTERCONNECTION

The House amendment provides the Public Broadcasting Corporation with authority to assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs. The Senate version authorized the Corporation to assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of interconnection for the same purpose. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate version.

DEFINITION OF "INTERCONNECTION"

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment contain definitions of the term "interconnection". The only difference in the two versions is that in the House amendment "airborne systems" were specifically included in the definition. The words "airborne systems" have been deleted from the definition in the conference substitute as unnecessary since "interconnection" is defined to include "other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio stations".

ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON THE CORPORATION

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment prohibit the Public Broadcasting Corporation from owning or operating any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, or interconnection or program production facility. In addition, the Senate bill prohibits the Corporation from owning or operating any community antenna television system. The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

The House amendment contains provisions requiring an annual audit of the accounts of the Public Broadcasting Corporation by independent certified or licensed public accountants; and, for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations provides that "the financial transactions of the Corporation shall be subject to an audit by the General Accounting Office". The Senate bill contains no provisions with respect to records and audit.

The conference substitute is the same as the House version with two minor changes in order to make it clear that for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of the Corporation's operations the General Accounting Office is authorized, but not required, to audit the financial transactions of the Corporation. Thus, the following language from the House report on H.R. 6736 (the House companion bill to S. 1160) is an apt description of the provisions of the conference substitute relating to records and audit:

"Provision for a GAO audit was not originally included in H.R. 6736 because it was felt that such audits carry with them the power of the Comptroller General to settle and adjust the books being examined and that this authority would be contrary to the desired insulation of the Corporation from Government control. The Committee is also sensitive to the importance of having the Corporation free from Government control. However, the bill does not provide authority for the settlement of accounts. The provision is similar to that included in the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) with the exception that the audits are not required to be performed annually. It is expected that the GAO audits will be performed at such times as believed necessary by the Comptroller General or Congress in order to supplement the audits of the independent public accountants.

"The audits are to be performed in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and, in the case of GAO audits, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States."

STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL BROADCASTING

The House amendment authorizes a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining whether Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that such aid should take. Under the House version the study would be submitted to the President for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

The Senate bill authorizes a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio their relationship to each other and to instructional materials, and to such other aspects thereof as may be of assistance in determining what Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television and the form that aid should take. Under the Senate bill the study would be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before June 30, 1969.

Both versions authorize not to exceed \$500,000 for the study.

The conference substitute is the same in this respect as the Senate bill, except that the study must also be addressed to the question of whether Federal aid should be provided for instructional radio and television.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a minority member of the committee of conference, and ex officio a member of the subcommittee dealing with communications, I am familiar with this measure. I simply wish to say for the record that, through the years, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has been an authority upon, and has done yeoman service for, the creation, the advancement, and the protection of educational television.

This measure is, in my opinion, very important, and will prove highly beneficial. I wish to say that much of the credit for the work in preparation of this bill, and its consideration and passage, should go to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island; and when I say that, I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of every member of his subcommittee and the full committee, each of whom is familiar with his achievements in this field.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, but I emphasize that this was a bipartisan effort. All of the members of the committee, whether it was in the Subcommittee on Communications or the full Committee on Commerce, Republicans as well as Democrats, worked generously for one objective, and I believe that objective was accomplished. I think the credit belongs to all the members of the committee, but I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his kindness.

Mr. President, I am ready for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have just been informed by the secretary for the minority that our late distinguished and beloved colleague, Alexander Wiley, a former Senator from the State of Wisconsin, passed away this afternoon. I wish to take this occasion to express my own deep regrets and the regrets of my family.

I think of Alex Wiley as a man of jollity, of profundity, and of wisdom. I had the honor to serve under him in 1953, when I first came to the Senate and he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was Senator Wiley, as chairman of that committee, who designated me to go to Vietnam in 1954; and in that way he helped develop my interest in Southeast Asia.

It is with sadness that I note his passing. It was with regret that I heard the news. I extend, on behalf of all of us, my deep sympathy to Mrs. Wiley, and express the hope that his soul may rest in peace.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I, too, hear with great sorrow this sad news. Senator Wiley's office adjoined my office for many years; and if anybody ever had a friendly, sociable neighbor, he was that to me and to the employees in my office. I shall always remember his kindly face when he would come into our office bear-

ing a much appreciated gift of the fine cheese that is produced in the great State of Wisconsin, and laughingly tell us he was sharing his latest gift from Wisconsin with us.

He was just that kind of fellow—hospitable, warmhearted, friendly, charitable—and I deplore his passing. I extend, for myself and Mrs. Holland, our affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Wiley.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have just learned the sad news of the untimely death of former Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, who passed away at High Oaks Christian Science Sanitarium in Germantown, Md., early this afternoon.

The only information I have about the burial is that it will be at Chippewa Falls, Wis. As far as I know, the time of burial has not been announced.

The news saddens all of us who served with Senator Wiley for many years and who loved and respected him. Many of us will have some further things to say regarding our affection and admiration for former Senator Wiley at a future time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, too, in memory of Alex Wiley, former Senator from Wisconsin, who was at one time the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

He was a very distinguished, very sweet, and very special human being with a heart as big as his body. He served his Nation according to his lights in a great exemplary way.

We shall miss him. I join my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa, in honoring former Senator Wiley, a man who served his country magnificently and who warrants the appreciation and warmest gratitude of the Nation.

We extend our deepest condolences to his family.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the death of former Senator Alexander Wiley this afternoon is a deep personal shock to me.

Senator Wiley was the senior Senator from Wisconsin when I was first elected to this body. He and his charming wife Dorothy were sensitive and gracious hosts to my wife and me from the moment we arrived in Washington.

Senator Wiley's humor and his warm friendliness were characteristics I shall never forget.

Senator Wiley served our State longer than any other Senator in history. His four full terms were characterized by a devotion to the interests of our Nation throughout the world as well as to Wisconsin.

It was Senator Wiley who fought on year after year for the St. Lawrence Seaway until he finally won the battle that had seemed virtually impossible to win over the opposition of powerful economic and political forces.

In many ways, the greatest contribution Senator Wiley made to America and all mankind was as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator Wiley assumed the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee at a time when isolationist forces opposed to foreign aid and our involvement with the United Nations were strong in

the Middle West and especially strong in Wisconsin. It would have been easy and politically advantageous for the Senator to exploit these sentiments for political advantage.

But Senator Wiley in a decision of courage and conviction, risked his career by using the great office of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to advance America's responsibility both in the United Nations and in helping countries throughout the world.

When he ran for reelection in 1956 Senator Wiley paid the price when he faced the most vigorous kind of opposition in the Republican primary in Wisconsin. He was opposed by an extraordinarily able opponent. He lost the endorsement of his party. He had to fight for renomination alone against the entire Republican organization in Wisconsin. He won and went on to a landslide general election victory.

Mr. President, the country has lost a fine and decent man. Wisconsin has lost a son of which it can be proud.

TRIBUTE TO MOHAMMAD REZA SHAH PAHLAVI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS CORONATION AS KING OF IRAN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a very unusual event that is taking place in Iran today—the coronation of a monarch 26 years after he ascended the throne and to the particular significance of this delay.

Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi declined to be crowned when he came to the throne in 1941. He declared at that time that it was no honor for him to reign over a nation in which a large portion of the people were destitute. The young Shah immediately dedicated himself to the task of improving the social and economic condition of the citizens of his country. Behind the pageantry and festivities that will accompany the coronation ceremonies in Iran today lies a quarter of a century of solid economic and social progress.

The Shah has proven to be a true revolutionary leader and, under his guidance, the economic and social face of Iran is being changed.

Iran's progress is also of special interest for it provides a heartening example of the contribution that our AID programs can make in a developing area when accompanied by political stability and enlightened local leadership. Our AID assistance to Iran is now coming to an end because the country has achieved the economic momentum to move forward on its own. We are terminating our economic assistance to Iran because the goals of our AID program have been largely achieved. This has been possible because the Iranian Government has made good use of the assistance that it has received from us and others, and because it has been ready and willing to undertake the sacrifices necessary for economic development.

Much of the credit for Iran's successful utilization of American economic assistance goes to the determination and efforts of Iranian leadership to provide economic and social progress for the peo-

ple of Iran. We are all too aware that this is not always the case in countries that are the beneficiaries of large amounts of American AID.

The United States has provided Iran a total of \$886,600,000 in economic assistance since 1951. As a result of this large expenditure of U.S. funds—over a period during which the country faced a number of severe political and economic crises—Iran is today a stable, prospering, independent land and a firm member of the family of free nations.

In his determination to develop his nation economically and socially, the Shah has not been satisfied merely to seek foreign assistance. Rather, under the Shah's personal leadership, Iran has devoted an ever increasing amount of its own resources to development programs. At present some 80 percent of the nation's substantial revenue from oil production is being used for development projects. During the period 1955 to 1962, U.S. economic assistance to Iran amounted to some \$566 million. During this same period, Iranian investment in development totaled \$1.2 billion, a ratio of almost 3 to 1. In the latest period, 1963-66, the ratio of Iranian expenditures for development to U.S. economic assistance was better than 10 to 1. Iran spent \$1.5 billion on development projects during these years compared to a total of \$136 million received in American assistance.

In recent years American corporations have shown increasing interest in investment in Iran, attracted both by the continuing economic growth of the country and the political stability that it enjoys. The flow of private American investment capital into Iran has now replaced U.S. Government assistance funds, and the rate of American investments in Iran is steadily increasing as new opportunities in the expanding economy develop.

Today, Iran is a billion-dollar import market, and the United States is Iran's second largest supplier, having supplied almost 20 percent of Iran's total imports last year. The size of this market is expected to double over the next 5 years, offering another billion-dollar opportunity for trade growth.

These are a few of the positive results that have sprung from the Shah's successful revolution. The coronation today will climax the first phase of this revolution. But the revolution in Iran is continuing and the country and its citizens can look forward to even greater advances.

I think that we would all wish to join in offering the Shah our congratulations on this occasion and to extend our best wishes to him and to his people.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS FOLLOWING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills presented to him today, even following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1967, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26, 1967:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit.

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1967

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Reverend R. L. Miller, Greater Institutional A.M.E. Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, the might of all who trust in Thee, look with mercy upon us as a nation and with concern upon these our legislative fathers who hold the responsibility of her public peace, law, and order, and the togetherness of her citizens of varied races and nationalities. May they never forget their answerableness to the people whom they serve, and to that people's God; nor ever lose their patriotism in partisanship, their ministry of social responsibility in material servility, their vision of truth in the stigmatism of petty considerations. Direct their counsels, strengthen their hands to honesty of purpose, that the life of our people, guided by wise policies, may be a nation pleasing in Thy sight, thus we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.